ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9974

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1878,
JAN-APR

# METHODIST

# QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## 1878.

VOLUME LX.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXX.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1878.

X 705370

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME LX.—1878.

## JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

ISLAM..... 5
Rev. T. J. Scott, D.D., India.

CITY METHODISM..... 27
H. K. Carroll, Esq., Religious Editor of the Independent.

EDUCATION AMONG THE FREEDMEN..... 43
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

THE BLUE LAW FORGERIES OF REV. SAMUEL PETERS..... 67
William L. Kingsley, Esq., New Haven, Conn.

WAS WESLEY ORDAINED A BISHOP BY ERASMUS?..... 88
Rev. George A. Phoebus, D.D., Newark, Del.

BISHOP BAKER..... 111
Rev. Charles Adams, D.D., Washington, D. C.

PHILO, THE JEW, [First Paper.]..... 121
Prof. James H. Worman, of Rockland Institute, Nyack, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 141
Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 163
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 168
Quarterly Book-Table..... 170
Wesley as a Greek Bishop?..... 195

## APRIL NUMBER.

EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY. [First Paper.]..... 197
James Strong, S.T.D., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

OUR SOUTHERN FIELD..... 219
Rev. E. Q. Fuller, D.D., Atlanta, Ga.

SILENCE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCHES..... 233
Rev. S. L. Bowman, D.D., York, Pa.

SOME PHASES OF THE CHINESE PROBLEM..... 268
Rev. E. S. Todd, A.M., San Francisco, Cal.

THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN POLITICS..... 291
Rev. J. F. Richmond, New York.

METHODIST STATISTICS..... 311
Rev. W. H. De Puy, D.D., Assistant Editor of "Christian Advocate," New York.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 327
Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 347
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 351
Quarterly Book-Table..... 354

## JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

THE DOCTRINES AND DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH..... 389
Rev. E. O. Haven, D.D., Chancellor of Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

MYSTICISM..... 412
Prof. James E. Latimer, Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

SCHLIEMANN'S TROJAN RESEARCHES..... 426
Prof. Henry M. Baird, D.D., University of the City of New York.

CASE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES..... 448
Rev. Edward Barrass, Hampton, Ontario, Canada.

EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY. [Second Paper.]..... 462
Prof. James Strong, S.T.D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

BIBLE WINES..... 480
Rev. Prof. F. D. Hemenway, D.D., Evanston, Ill.

TYERMAN'S LIFE OF WHITEFIELD..... 491
Rev. J. I. Boswell, Bound Brook, N. J.

THE "ATONEMENT" OF THE EARLY CHURCH NO PRICE PAID TO SATAN..... 504
Prof. Henry C. Sheldon, Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 525
Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 547
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 555
Quarterly Book-Table..... 556

## OCTOBER NUMBER.

MADAME DE STAËL'S "GERMANY"..... 581
Abel Stevens, LL.D., Switzerland.

TAYLER LEWIS: IN MEMORIAM..... 604
Prof. William Wells, LL.D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

THE NEW ETHICS..... 631
Prof. Lacroix, Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio.

PLAGIARISM AND THE LAW OF QUOTATION..... 647
Rev. Henry J. Fox, D.D., Hyde Park, Mass.

DANIEL WEBSTER..... 659
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION AND THE HIGHER LIFE..... 683
Rev. J. Townley Crane, D.D., Port Jervis, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 715
Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 734
Quarterly Book-Table..... 738

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## JANUARY, 1878.

### ART. I.—ISLAM.

RELIGIOUS toleration is a virtue, brightening into greater excellence in later generations. It is one of the hopeful signs of the age that the bigotry that could formerly find no trace of the heavenly Father's love and guidance in the history and literature of non-Christian peoples, is giving place to a recognition of the fact that God has not left himself without witness in any nation; and that, while the dispensation of non-Christian peoples has no glory compared with the glory that excelleth in the kingdom of heaven, still a dispensation admitting of salvation they have had—a dispensation of the Spirit, and of the broken light of tradition, with scattered fragments of God's revealed word. All in their religious systems is not irredeemably bad. But when this spirit of toleration degenerates into a sickly sentimentalism that elevates Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Mohammedanism into a brotherhood of religions coordinate with Christianity, and makes Buddha and Manu and Mohammed almost, if not quite, equal to Jesus, it is time that we seek a wholesome reaction against this spirit of extreme liberality.

Mohammedanism has come in for its full share of exaltation. We have from the pen of an Englishman, Mr. Davenport, "An Apology for Mohammed and the Koran," * followed by

* Davy & Sons. London. 1869.

a Moslem author, Syed Ahmed Khan of India, in "Essays on the Life of Mohammed."* intended as an apology for English readers, and claiming Islam to be a benefactor of the race and of the "Christian dispensation!" Then comes R. Bosworth Smith with "Mohammed and Mohammedanism,"† boldly claiming that "among the moral teachers of the world Mohammed occupies the most historic position. He is pre-eminently the last of the prophets." At the time this audacious defense was being written, another Moslem author was also writing in England, "A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed."‡ With more boldness than "critical" ability, he bravely claims that the unsuccessful siege of Constantinople by the Moslems in the eighth century, and their defeat in France by Charles Martel in the same century, were two great calamities "which materially retarded the progress of the world, and put back the hour-hand of time for centuries." Professor J. W. Draper also makes Mohammed a "messenger of God" to our race.§ Here we have liberality of the broadest type. Mr. Davenport tells us that Mohammed must "undoubtedly be acknowledged as the very greatest man whom Asia can call her son, if not one of the rarest and most transcendent geniuses the world ever produced." His entire book is a defense of the Koran and its author. Bosworth Smith writes:—

> The two great religions which started from kindred soil, the one from Mecca, the other from Jerusalem, might work on in their respective spheres, the one the religion of progress, the other of stability; the one of complex life, the other of simple life; the one dwelling more upon the inherent weakness of human nature, the other on its inherent dignity . . . each rejoicing in the success of the other, each supplying the other's wants in a generous rivalry for the common good of humanity.—P. 232.

Thus would our authors elevate Islam to the dignity of co-partnership with the religion of Him who said, "I am the light of the world;" "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "Come unto *me, all* ye that labor and are heavy laden." Smith writes of Mohammed that "compared with the long

* Trübner & Co. London. 1870. † William & Norgate. London. 1873.
‡ Smith, Elder, & Co. London. 1874.
§ "Intellectual Development of Europe." Harper & Bros. New York. 1863.

roll of great men whom the world by common consent has called great . . . take him all in what he was and what he did, and what those inspired by him have done, he seems to me to stand alone above and beyond them all." "If ever any man had a right to say he ruled by right divine, it was Mohammed." "Christianity will one day, I venture to believe, agree in yielding to him that (title) of a prophet, a very prophet of God." "In my opinion he comes next to him (Jesus) in the long roll of the great benefactors of the race." Thus the son of Abdoola is elevated to a place by the Son of God! Bigotry and intolerance of the narrowest type are much less dangerous to truth than this. Well may we raise the inquiry, In what degree is Islam and its founder worthy of so great praise? Are we to look upon Islam as the "best ally" of Christianity, and yield "homage to the noble sincerity" of Mohammed? When men like the Rev. Professor Blyden, of Liberia, are carried away by the specious writing of these latitudinarians, and seem to see in Islam innumerable blessings for Africa, it is time we have a re-examination and restatement of this subject.* The attempt must be made in fairness, with a charity that would think no evil, and yet undeterred by the cry of bigotry and intolerance. "Truth is above all men."

Two lines of brief inquiry are before us: First. What is the moral character of Mohammedanism? Second. What are its effects on the world?

I. The first line of inquiry we confine to two points: first, the founder of the system; second, his book. The founder of a system of religion or philosophy and his book become alternatively each a means of interpreting the other. The man is often an explanation of his system and the system of the man.

Mohammed, son of Abdoola, a prince of the tribe of Koreish, was born at Mecca, in Arabia, A. D. 570 or 571. The *Hayat ul Kuloob*, a Persian life of Mohammed, describes him as above medium height, with broad chest and good figure; head large, with long hair parted in the middle, nose aquiline. A line of fine black hair extended down his chest. He walked with a slight stoop, and looked from the corners of

* See Article "Mohammedanism and the Negro Race" in this Quarterly for January, 1877.

his eyes. He went in trading expeditions into Syria, and was thus brought in contact with Jews and Christians. Many of these, indeed, resided in Northern Arabia, and thus Mohammed found opportunity to become, in some degree, acquainted with their history, traditions, and doctrines. He was uneducated, but manifestly a man of superior genius, of quiet, thoughtful, cunning observation, and capacious memory. His intercourse with the Jews and Christians impressed him with the superiority of their belief over the fetichism and idolatry of the desert tribes. It is difficult to estimate the factors that contributed to the formation of his remarkable character. The Koran testifies to his partial knowledge of the sacred Scriptures; also to his more extended acquaintance with the traditions and fables of the Jews and early Christians. The effects of Zoroastrianism also appears. Mohammed early won the title "*Al Ameen*," the faithful. It is just, perhaps, to suppose that he really meditated the moral improvement of his people, yet an impartial estimate of his entire life compels the conclusion that from a simple life and laudable purpose there was an awful descent to a life of ambition, deception, and lust. Some of the earlier writers, as Prideaux, Maracci, and White, were, perhaps, too sweeping in their estimate of his entire life. Still it must be noted that while later writers, Sprenger, Muir, Rodwell, and others, admit that there seems to have been something amiable and noble in his earlier years, afterward the life of Mohammed reveals the great deceiver consciously fabricating a system of religion as direct from God—at first peaceably, and then by the sword.

Sprenger says Mohammed's character was deeply marked by "cunning," and that one of his most distinguishing characteristics was "dark and bloody fanaticism." Foster says, "His personal habits were grossly sensual, and became worse as he advanced in years and hardened in the latitude of successful imposture." Muir says, "The heart of Mohammed was vindictive and revengeful—ambition, rapine, and assassination are the undenied features of his later life. . . . Mohammed deliberately yielded to a compromise with evil." Bosworth Smith admits Muir to be an impartial writer, and this is his opinion of Smith's hero. The first of a new series of works on Islam is

recently out by Major Osborn, of Her Majesty's Indian Army.* The author, a liberal thinker, seems to be going over the ground with great fairness. "There are," he writes, "modern biographers of the prophet who would have us believe that he was not conscious of falsehood. He was under a hallucination, of course, but he believed what he said. This to me is incredible. Mohammed was guilty of falsehood under circumstances where he deemed the end justified the means." Fortunately the historical materials clustering round this subject have been so closely scrutinized and so thoroughly sifted that we are pretty sure now of the "naked facts." Moreover, able translations of the Koran lay bare the workings of its author's mind. Did our space admit, quotations would amply illustrate each point presented. A few references, direct and indirect, must suffice.

*Mohammed was a great deceiver.*—He is guilty, as Muir affirms, of the "high blasphemy of forging the name of God." This was, without doubt, deliberate, studied, persistent. He boldly assumed the position before the world of one in direct communication with God, from whom he received verbal messages.† His constant reiteration in the Koran of the inspiration of his messages, betrays anxiety to maintain his prophetic character—betrays consciousness of fraud. Truth and honesty are calm and self-possessed. The Koran is largely made up of legends, as already mentioned. These are artfully worked up, and presented as direct revelations of historic fact. It is the work of a mountebank to get the fact and then pretend supernatural information. (See Sale's Koran, chaps. xii and xxxviii.) The messages were given during a period of twenty-three years, and just as suited the varying fortunes of the prophet. The emergency never failed to bring a message; and as the circumstances of the prophet changed greatly during his career, we might expect change and confliction in the import of the messages. Such there was, and some of the faithful were tempted to mistrust Mohammed. A revelation was at hand for this emergency also: "Whatever verse we shall abrogate or cause thee to forget, we will bring a better than it" (chap. ii.)‡ Moslem doctors admit that there are some two hundred and

* "Islam Under the Arabs." London: Longman's, Green, & Co. 1876.

† Muir suggests the possibility of satanic inspiration.

‡ Sale's "Translations of the Koran" is always referred to in this article.

twenty-five verses that are thus abrogated, and among these in the attempt at consistency we have the singular inadvertence of an earlier verse abrogating a later. To illustrate this subject of conflicting messages, at one time Moslems were directed to pray toward Jerusalem. This was to interest the Jews; but this obstinate people, resisting the claims of the prophet, a counter message required the faithful to pray toward Mecca. In his earlier career, when his followers were few and weak, Mohammed's messages were all peaceable. "Verily thou art a preacher," Gabriel often whispers to him; but after the *hegira*, or flight from Mecca to Medina, when numbers began to trust him, and an army became a thing possible, messages of a warlike character began to descend, and the meek Moslems became the fierce Saracen hordes that swept the world in a tornado of fire and blood. In the Mecca messages all is conciliation, patience, peace; in the Medina messages it is "war to the knife." These passages abound: "Fight, therefore, for the religion of God." "Strike off their heads." "Fight against them till there be no opposition."

The facility with which Mohammed found messages to defend his own conduct when questioned betrays the conscious deceiver. To illustrate, the polygamy that he sanctioned for all time in his system by pretended revelation, became to him a snare and perplexity. But Gabriel's message always solved the difficulty, and justified him before his scandalized followers. Did he, in his anxious proclivities, surround himself with more wives than the legal four allowed the faithful, an opportune message from Gabriel gave him unlimited privilege, (chapter xxxiii.) Did his coveting the wife of his adopted son ensnare him, a message justifies the whole affair. Did his aberrations with beautiful slaves lead to a domestic embroglio in the well-filled harem, a message quiets all and gives him a dispensation of lust, (chap. lxvi.) It is of this man Smith writes, he had "unfaltering belief in his own inspiration to the last." By facts like these his sincerity must be judged.

*Mohammed was guilty of Assassinations.*—Muir says, "Ambition, rapine, assassination, are the undenied features of his life." Syed Ameer Ali, in his Life of Mohammed, makes a very weak attempt at a blinding diversion, in commenting on the bloody work of his prophet, by referring to the "tortures

of the rack and stake which destroyed myriads of innocent beings in Christian Europe." But the Prophet of Nazareth never sanctioned such work. Mohammed did sanction the destruction of "innocent beings," and was the author of several foul assassinations: his first victim, Asma, a woman who had written satirical verses about him. "Who will rid me of this woman?" he asked. Omeir heard the question, and bathed his scimiter in the blood of Asma as she slept in the midst of her children. "See a man who hath assisted the Lord and his prophet," Mohammed said the next day in the mosque. Another victim was an old Jew, whose life was the forfeit, in the dead of night, for having ridiculed the prophet. A third victim was Kab, another Jew, who was, by the order of Mohammed, enticed to a lonely spot and hewn to pieces. The Jews, by their stubbornness and superior intelligence, were enemies not to be endured, and after this last murder the faithful received a *carte-blanché* to slay the Jews at will. Muir says, "The butchery of the Coreitza (a Jewish tribe) leaves a dark stain of infamy on the character of Mohammed." Arnold, favorable in many respects to his character, says, "he had recourse to the base and treacherous measure of attacking the Koreshites (an Arab tribe) during the sacred months," when they could not defend themselves. These things are too much for even Bosworth Smith; but he lightly passes them by as "one or two acts of summary, uncompromising punishment, possibly, one or two acts of cunning." By this record of blood Mohammed must be tried.

*During the years of his assumed prophetic office the life of Mohammed was marked by the grossest polygamy and lust.*—He sanctioned polygamy and lust by his pretended revelations, and then availing himself of the largest license of his system, lust became at once the result and the cause of his depravity. He began by limiting the wives of the faithful to four, with the unlimited use of female slaves and captives. But for himself he added wife to wife till he had passed the legal four and presided over a harem of fifteen or more wives, to whom slaves and concubines were added. As we have seen, the lawlessness of his own life, in view of his restrictions for others, scandalized his followers, but their misgivings were quieted by fresh revelations, which left the prophet, by special dispensa-

tion, in possession of the largest liberty. "O prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee, and any believing woman if she give herself to the prophet" (chap. xxxiii.) Even for that loose age and people there were irregularities in the way Mohammed took some of his wives that were too much for the faithful; but, as we have seen in the case of Zaid's wife, Gabriel was at hand with his message of justification. "We joined her in marriage unto thee—no crime is to be charged to the prophet as to what God hath allowed" (chap. xxxiii.) Surrounded by many wives, he indulged a still wider license, which embroiled him in many a conjugal commotion. Mariam, a Coptic slave, sent him by Mokawkas, governor of Egypt, was a great cause of disturbance in the prophet's harem, and his relation to her is justified in chap. lxvi of the Koran. There are stories, and comments, and artless explanations in Moslem writers relating to these matters too vile to be transferred to these pages.

When the liberality of some, in this liberal day, would clothe this man with the authority of a veritable "prophet of God," these facts must be reviewed. No stretch of charity can cover up the deception, unscrupulousness, blood-guiltiness, and lust here revealed. No theory of honesty or self-deception can be maintained. Mohammed attempted to screen himself in this wickedness "by the high blasphemy of forging the name of God." One who has carefully studied this subject writes: "We readily admit that bad men have sometimes been, like Balaam and others, the divinely-appointed organs of inspiration; but in the case of Mohammed, his professed inspiration sanctioned and encouraged his own vices. That which ought to have been the fountain of purity was, in fact, the cover of the prophet's depravity."*

From Mohammed we turn to the Koran. As intimated, they mutually explain each other. From the Koran, too, we are justified in drawing *à priori* inference as to the probable effects of Islam on the world. A book that molds the faith and life of one hundred and fifty millions of souls deserves our study. Mohammed was forty years old when his revelations began,

* "Notes on Mohammedanism." By the Rev. T. P. HUGHES, Missionary to the Afghans. London: Allen & Co. 1875.

and they were continued for twenty-three years. He claimed that Gabriel brought *verbatim* messages. There is, as we have intimated, but little originality in the Koran. The Talmud and apocryphal gospels contribute much to it. The *style* of the Koran has been extravagantly praised by some Moslems, and yet decried by others. It may well be doubted if the charm consists in much beyond rhythmic repetitions and verbal jingling. The matter is not noble and ennobling; but seems infinitely below the Jewish prophetic Scriptures or the Gospels. Gibbon's famous criticism is, that the Koran is "an endless, incoherent rhapsody of fable and precept and declaration, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds." Of later date is the criticism of Dr. Draper, whose review of the Koran Professor Blyden calls "able." We read: "Its most celebrated passages, as those on the nature of God, in chapters ii and xxiv, will bear no comparison with parallel ones in the Psalms and Book of Job." "An impartial reader of the Koran may doubtless be surprised that so feeble a production should serve its purpose so well." "The Koran betrays a human and not very intellectual origin." * But we are seeking for the moral character of this book.

*The Koran lowers the moral character of God.*—It is profuse in declarations of his awful majesty, and his irresistible power, and absolute sovereignty; but we miss the tenderness and divine sympathy of the Psalms and prophets, and especially the soul-winning revelations of the Divine Fatherhood found in the Gospels. In the Koran, God is the irresistible Ruler rather than moral Governor. His Fatherhood is hardly mentioned. One is shocked with the savagery of the descriptions of hell. We have frequent passages running thus: "They shall have garments of fire fitted unto them; their bowels shall be dissolved thereby, and also their skins, and they shall be beaten with maces of iron" (chapter xxii.) "Verily, those who disbelieve in our signs we will surely cast to be broiled in hell fire. So often as their skins shall be burned, we will give them in exchange other skins, that they may taste the sharper torments" (chapter iv.) Brief and terrible gleams of the state of the lost are given in the New Testament, and the curtain drops. Misery there is, but it does not seem to be the work of a fiend.

* "Intellectual Development of Europe," pp. 254, 255.

The descriptions of the Koran are disgusting—hideous. The torments of the damned are simply revolting. One is repelled by the God of this book. His character is not such as to inspire penitence and awaken moral life. He leads men into sin. This is the express import of too many passages, to admit of any explanation other than a sovereign caprice misleading and destroying men without mercy.

*The Koran teaches a fate the most absolute and unqualified.*—This is the sixth article in the Moslem creed. Mohammed made effective use of this doctrine in the Koran. By it his followers are encouraged to desperation and recklessness, in fighting against the unbelievers. Every one familiar with the daily life of Moslems knows how much they are influenced by the idea of fate. It is a solace in trial, a consolation in defeat, a blight to every energy, an excuse for every crime. In India *taqdir* is the ready answer for every act of wickedness.

*The Koran upholds slavery in its worst forms.*—It has not the humane regulations of the Jewish law. By that law if a master killed his slave he was punished. Not so in Islam. The Koran grants unlimited concubinage with female slaves. "Take in marriage of such other women as please you, one, two, or three, or four, and not more, or the slaves which ye have acquired" (chapter iv.) "O, prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, and the slaves that thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee" (chapter xxxiii.) According to the *Hayat ul Kulul*, Mohammed had thirty-nine slaves, some of these, the gifts of rulers, were his favorite concubines. It is this license of the Koran that renders slavery so popular in all Mohammedan countries. Palgrave, in his "Central and Eastern Arabia," writes of "the universality of concubinage between the master and his female slaves." It is surprising that Professor Blyden, referring to Mr. Freeman's statement that Mohammedanism "has consecrated slavery," puts with equal propriety the remark into the mouth of a Moslem, that "Christianity has consecrated Negro slavery." Slavery is not inherent in the Christian system—it is a consecrated part of Islam. The New Testament does not sanction slavery, the Koran does, and in a most demoralizing form, and Moslem doctors elaborately defend the system.

*The Koran sanctions polygamy.*—It is an astonishing state-

ment of Bosworth Smith, that "it is not fair to represent polygamy as a part of Mohammedanism any more than it is to represent slavery as a part of Christianity."

The New Testament never gives a word of sanction for slavery. The Koran lays down the law for polygamy, (chapter iv,) and Moslem writers defend it on "natural, social, and religious grounds." * True, polygamy existed among the patriarchs, and in the time of the Mosaic economy, and possibly among the early Christian converts from paganism, but we never find the system sanctioned as in the Koran. In keeping with polygamy, it provides for easy and almost unlimited divorce. (Chapters ii, iv, xxiii.)

*The Koran panders to the carnal heart and fosters lust.*—The impartial student of this book cannot resist the conclusion that sensuality is made an element of enticement and power in Islam. Proof of this grave charge is found in what we have presented on the slavery and polygamy of the Koran. Mr. Kennedy, who has lived among the Moslems of India for nearly forty years, writes: "Truth compels us to state facts, which prove that Mohammed has done more, perhaps, than any man who ever lived to degrade woman, and thereby degrade man."† The license of polygamy and slave concubinage is a hot-bed for the growth of unbounded lust. As we have seen, provision is made in the Koran for unlimited divorce. It is impossible to estimate the depraving effects on Islam of this law.

> Wherever marriage is lightly esteemed, there is great danger that every tie will become loose. Unless the law be strong and strict enough to silence and suppress the roving imagination and roving desire, and to settle completely all thought of breaking or overstepping the sacred limit, disorder, licentiousness, and moral anarchy commence. A sensual tone pervades the life. And it is a universal law, that where sexual license prevails, lawlessness of every other kind prevails. Lust and cruelty ever go together."‡

Now the tendency of the Koran is not only *not* to restrain, but it actually *pampers* lust.

The heaven of the Koran panders to the carnal heart. Mr. Smith tries to parry what may be said against "the gross nature

* Syed Ahmad Khan's "Life of Mohammed." Fourth Essay.

† "Christianity and the Religion of India," p. 255.

‡ Whedon on the New Testament, vol. i, p. 224.

of Mohammed's paradise and the blackeyed houris" by insisting that "this is not, in the main, a true, and still less is it an adequate, account of the matter;" but those who have spent long years among Moslems, who know the views of their doctors, and can produce traditions of the prophet himself, showing that he intended a literal meaning for the descriptions of the Koran, may be excused if they continue to believe that Mohammed held out a paradise of carnal pleasure for the faithful. In chapters lv and lvi we find the most complete description of the "beauteous damsels," of "large black eyes," "reposing on couches adorned with gold," while "goblets and beakers of flowing wine" are passed round, all "for the delight of the companions of the right hand." Orthodox Moslem commentators do not hesitate about the literal explanation. The natural evil tendency of such teachings is well illustrated by the lines of a Moslem, *Umr-i-Khayyam*, a celebrated Persian poet, thus:—

> "They tell us of a heavenly garden,
> Where the clear wine will sparkle, and the dark-eyed damsel smile.
> With joys like these hereafter,
> Why not wine and woman now?"

But one more of the many charges that may be made:—

*The Koran is in tone bitter and intolerant, and it inculcates the propagation of Islam by the sword.*—Writers like Professor Blyden are certainly deceived as to the true spirit of Islam, begotten and fostered by the teaching of the Koran, when they describe the tender sympathy of Moslem missionaries, as they gently teach the degraded whom they seek to elevate, entering often into loving wedlock with the newly-won faithful. There must be a reason for the muffled paw of the tiger in West Africa. The spirit of the Koran is, in the main, intolerant, and its legitimate fruit is a fierce fanaticism, in more recent times seen in the Nestorian and Cretan massacres, and in the Bulgarian atrocities. Moslem bigotry and intolerance is forever goading the Christian subjects of Mohammedan rule into desperate rebellion. A writer in the Indian Evangelical Review * catches the spirit of the Koran precisely:—

* Review for October, 1876—"Bombay, India." C. N. Chapin, 1 Somerset-street, Boston.

The most frightful objurgations against Christians, Jews, and Polytheists, Mohammed's enemies, and all who reject the smallest part of his revelations, are to be found in every chapter; while the torments of the damned are described with even greater gusto than the rewards of the faithful. It is pretty certain that if a single Old Testament book contained, in proportion to its length, one fifth of the cursing and bitterness that the Koran does, it would have been used over and over again by the theists as the strongest possible argument against the reception of any part of the Bible.

Apostates from Islam are to be slain without mercy (chap. iv.) Crescentade, or holy war against the infidels, is taught in numerous passages running thus: "Whosoever fighteth for this religion of God we will surely give him a great reward." "Excite the faithful to war." "God hath preferred those who fight for the faith." "Fight against them till there be no opposition and the religion be wholly God's." "When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads until ye have made a great slaughter."

It reveals but small capacity for the task he has undertaken in the defense of Islam when Syed Ameer Ali seeks to compare the "struggles in self-defense" (!!) of Islam with the frightful wars of Jews and Christians for the propagation of their respective faiths." Where in the Old or New Testament are these "frightful wars" inculcated? But the Koran is full of incitement to war for the propagation of Islam. Mohammed himself led some twenty-seven military expeditions. The entire history of Islam is a forcible comment on the passages just quoted. Some Moslem doctors teach that the faithful should never remain subject to infidel rule. The frequent reply of the fierce Moslem disputant to the missionary is, "the proper argument against you is the sword."

Such is the Prophet of Arabia, with his manifold tergiversations and manifest deceptions, with his polygamy and slave concubinage, with his assassinations and blood-guiltiness, till he died in the arms of Ayesha, bitterly cursing the Jews and Christians. Such is his book, with its baneful doctrine of fate, its teachings on slavery and war, its sanction of polygamy and lust. What marvel that the Koran seemed to one of the faithful capable of a double interpretation! Al-Jahedi, a Moslem doctor, insisted that the Koran is a body, which can be turned

into a man or beast. Muir, an Arabic scholar of undoubted reputation, and not open to the regret of Professor Blyden for Bosworth Smith, "that he had not access to the force and beauty of the original," says that even the Arabic, as molded by the system that grew out of the precepts of the Koran, is full of impurities. What if the fabricator of such a book does "guide the daily life of one third * of the human race." Does this, as Dr. Draper suggests, "justify the title of a messenger of God?" Without prejudging the case, we might anticipate that the effects of a religious system originating with such a teacher and inspired by such a book, must be baneful on the world. Here we turn to

II. *The effects of Islam on the World.*

A class of writers, as we have seen, advance Islam to the position of a Godsent religion, fraught with unmingled good to our race, "the generous rival of Christianity for the good of humanity." We have a new era in the discussion of Mohammedanism, and this claim is now emphatically before the bar of the world. In the light of facts it must be judged. If what we have written about Mohammed and the Koran be true, then, *à priori*, we might be certain that Islam founded by a deceiver, perpetuated in fraud, and involving errors fundamental, vicious, and vice-producing, would be most pernicious in its effects on the world. Arguments from some incidental benefits, such as result from almost every evil or calamity, must not blind us to the real character of a system essentially baleful in tendency.

The rapidity of the Moslem conquests finds no parallel in history. The swiftness of the serried Macedonian phalanx and the resistless sweep of the mighty Roman legion, are eclipsed by the wild-rushing tornado of the Saracen horde. Within a hundred years from the death of the prophet, who bequeathed his sword to Abu Bakr, the vast tide of conquest rolled from the Oxus to the Pillars of Hercules. "*Alla akbar!*" (God is great,) was the battle cry. Damascus, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, Cordova, how rapidly these fell before the storm! "Paradise and the houris are before your faces, hell and the devils are behind your backs!" cried

* A remarkable exaggeration. Moslems are less than one ninth of the world's population.

Khalid, in the great battle of Aijnadin, and the legions of the Emperor Heracleus were crushed with terrible slaughter. We cannot dwell on the subtle, powerful motive that impelled, and the circumstances that favored, the conquests of this desolating host. Fate, fanaticism, lust and spoil, welded into a mighty bolt and hurled against faction-weakened peoples, could hardly fail to crush all opposition. Such was Islam. Our purpose now is with the effects of the system on the countries conquered. They have not been morally elevated. How could they be by such a system, propagated by such men? In the death of Mohammed's successors we have a significant glimpse of the spirit that prevailed. Omar was assassinated by a slave; Othman was murdered by his mutinous soldiers; Ali died from the wounds of Moslems received in a mosque; Hassan was poisoned by his wife; Hussein was shamefully mangled by Moslem soldiers; and thus runs the list. So died the conquerors, and proof cannot be produced that any country overrun by Islam has been morally elevated. What is Arabia today, its original seat; and Mecca, whither all the tribes go up? Speaking of the Wahabees, the Puritans of Islam, Palgrave, who has thoroughly studied them in their home, says:—

> The base-work and ground-color of their character is envy and hatred. Rapacity and licentiousness, though seldom wholly wanting, are accessory embellishments. . . . Of morality, justice, and judgment, mercy and truth, purity of heart and tongue, and all that makes man better, I never heard one syllable." *

This is legitimate to the system, which is in itself a moral blight of a deadly type. Sir William Muir, cautious almost to a fault in coming to conclusions, which he drew from original sources, writes:—

> Setting aside considerations of minor importance, three radical evils flow from the faith. . . . First, polygamy, divorce, and slavery are maintained—striking, as they do, at the root of public morals, poisoning public life, and disorganizing society. Second, freedom of judgment in religion is crushed and annihilated. Toleration is unknown. Third, a barrier has been interposed against the reception of Christianity.†

Hughes testifies:—

> Notwithstanding its fair show of outward observance, and its severe legal enactments, there is something in Islam that strikes at

* "Central Arabia." † "Life of Mahommed."

the very root of morals, poisons domestic life, and in its truest sense disorganizes society. . . . A barrier has been raised not merely against the advance of Christianity, but against the progress of civilization itself. *

Low as was the moral life of Syria, Egypt, and North Africa, where rival Christian sects had almost lost the light and power of the Gospel, Islam left a deposit of depraving ideas that soon sunk those countries much lower. In its wide sway from India to Spain it has done nothing to correct the falsehood, lust, and blood-thirstiness of men, but it has been a pestilential atmosphere developing these into rank and rapid growth. Unscrupulous and persistent in its efforts to make converts, it has made them twofold more the children of hell. The essential spirit of the system is a bloody fanaticism. Major Osborn writes:—

Beheading was most common, but khalifs and governors exhibited a truly devilish ingenuity in devising torments for their enemies. Oriental history abounds with stories of almost incredible cruelty, and these impress the reader with the more horror, because they are told without any expression of wonder and reproach. They were too common to provoke such feeling. †

Twelve centuries have not changed the moral life of Islam except as slightly modified by the system it seeks to override and sweep away. Recall the atrocities perpetrated on the Nestorians—the inhabitants of Crete—the terrible days of the Indian mutiny. Witness the 15,000 butchered Bulgarians, with their hundreds of ravished women and thousands of plundered homes, all put beyond dispute by Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet. Sir George Campbell, writing from the very scene of this fiendish work—and mark, in the most enlightened Moslem rule in the world—says, "There is no sort of doubt of the horror of the atrocities. These things are in no degree exaggerated. I have seen a good deal in my day, but never any thing to compare for one moment with this; and I am satisfied there has been nothing like it in modern times." Now if Islam in the regions described by Professor Blyden is the humane, gentle, loving, reforming thing he seems to find it to be, then we have a phenomenon in the history of the system. It has departed from its traditional animus, and there must be an explanation somewhere. Rev. J. T. Gracey, who recently visited the West

* "Notes on Mohammedanism." † "Islam under the Arabs."

African coast, writes that Bishop Crowther (colored) refers the mild character of Moslems in part to ignorance of the Koran. Mr. Gracey, familiar with Islam for years, gives it as his opinion that the chief reason for this seeming liberality lies in the fact that they are after all only "semi-Mohammedan."* It may be that these disconnected tribes, of low intellectual life, became an easy prey to Islam, and its essential blood-thirstiness is not developed. And yet it is noteworthy that Mr. Gracey mentions a bitter controversy at Lagos, where only the interference of the governor prevented bloodshed.

Doubtless there is some appearance of improvement in the tribes; but reliable morality and well-organized domestic life can never come from Islam. "Never higher than the fountain" is true here also. Moreover, there is a subtle fallacy in the reasoning that seeks to prove Islam a blessing, even for benighted Africa. Doubtless Mormonism might, in many respects, improve the condition, intellectual and material, of the Indians about Salt Lake; but does it occur to any one that Mormonism would be a good evangelizer of the Indians? Should any one look with complacency upon that system of lust and rapine, spreading among the savages? Such a spread of Mormonism would be an incentive to all right-minded Christians to strive all the more mightily to spread the truth. Let no one be deceived into thinking that Islam will smooth the way for the Gospel in Africa. If Islam spreads over that continent, as some of its admirers seem to think it will, it will put off, perhaps for centuries, the conquest of the cross. It may be lamb-like now, because unopposed; but in the end it will be a more stubborn foe to evangelism than the darkness of fetichism and the blight of Africa's deadly malaria. Its spread should be the signal, not for complacency, but for active effort to spread the Gospel. Shame on the messengers of Jesus if they permit the propagandists of Islam to wrest Africa from them! We know not what Islam may be doing on the west coast, but its work on the east coast has been truly diabolical. The history of the slave-trade of the Zanguebar coast is a shadow dark enough to eclipse all the apparent good of the West. We may not speak of the horrors of the slave dhows, of the tens of thousands of girls herded into the shameless slave markets, and of help-

* Christian Advocate, April 5, 1877.

less boys treated with an indignity that may not be mentioned here; and yet Professor Blyden holds up the slavery of Christian nations—always bad enough—in unfavorable contrast with Moslem treatment of the Negro. Dr. Livingstone's entire testimony is against the idea of Africa having received any good from Islam.

But has the Koran, with its system, been the intellectual enlightener and civilizer that some persons claim? We have seen the moral bearing of this book. It is worse than worthless as to scientific value. Its not teaching science would be no argument against it if it had let science and the facts of nature and history alone, and not stated absurdities. According to the Koran the sun sets in a sea of black mud; shooting stars are fiery darts hurled at devils, who are trying to pry into the secrets of heaven; the earth is motionless, held steady by the mountains as vast weights; Alexander built a wall of brass mountain high to keep away Gog and Magog, and it is to remain till the judgment-day; and other puerilities that cannot be mentioned here. Draper says of the Koran, "In science it is absolutely worthless—its astronomy, cosmogony, physiology, invite our mirth." "An impartial reader of the Koran may, doubtless, be surprised that so feeble a production should serve its purpose so well." Its laws as to polygamy, slavery, commerce, calculation of time, etc., utterly unfit this inflexible system, which is founded upon it, for being adapted to a high form of civilization. And yet Syed Ameer Ali has the effrontery to challenge Christian Europe with the assertion that it owes its enlightenment to the Moslems, "whose achievements in the field of intellect owe their origin to the teachings of Mohammed!"

This learned Moslem, who, like all his coreligionists of modern times, owes his enlightenment to Christian Europe, but echoes what he has learned from European apologists of Islam. We may frankly acknowledge the service Moslem conquerors did in the earlier centuries in taking the torch of knowledge, *kindled to their hand by Jewish and Christian teachers*, and bearing it westward to Spain, whence some erudition shined into Western Europe; but this is no more a reason for patronizing Islam than for encouraging idolatry and polytheism because Greece, our master in philosophy and logic, in sculpture

and architecture, worshiped the gods many of the Pantheon. The Koran is opposed to freedom of thought. "To doubt or inquire is to be an infidel," say the teachers of Islam. The slavery of its absolute injunctions and hard literalism is fatal to the development of civilization. Progress, if at all, must be in spite of the spirit of Islam. It is almost a century since White wrote: "Through every country where Mohammedanism is professed the same deep pause is made in philosophy, and the same wide chasm is seen between the opportunities of men to improve and their actual improvement."* Palgrave, so much relied on for correct representations, writes of Arabia: "Islam is in its essence stationary, and was framed thus. Sterile like its God, lifeless like its first principle and supreme original, in all that constitutes true life . . . it justly repudiates all change, all advance and development."† There has been no development among the Turks, although constantly stimulated by the most enlightened nations of Europe. During the past fourteen years the writer of this article has been working in India, which contains a Moslem population nearly double that of the entire Turkish empire. Here Syed Ahmed Khan has been putting forth tremendous efforts to awaken intellectual life in those forty million Moslems. He has planned, and exhorted, and taunted—enduring all the while abuse from the fanatics, who hate enlightenment because it seems to be something Christian. It is true, as Professor Blyden writes, that in the ranks of Islam some "scholars are arising imbued with western knowledge," but they are not the representatives of real Islam. They are opposed to the orthodox traditions of the elders, and are seeking to explain away the manifest import of the Koran. Mr. Gracey, in his recent visit to the west coast of Africa, does not find the enlightenment and blessed effects of Islam mentioned by Bosworth Smith. He writes that Islam, "after more than a thousand years of effort to subjugate those pagan tribes, the Bornaus, Fulahs, Mandingoes, and Jaloofs, have only abandoned some of the rights of paganism, while their belief in some superstitions has been greatly intensified. . . . The center of all this heathenism, its very heart, is just what Mohammedanism has never touched." He refers to the testimony of a missionary, Mr. Picot, who thinks

* "Bampton Lectures." † "Central Arabia."

it would be a grand thing if the Moslem teachers could be made to leave the country.*

The question how far Islam was connected with the revival and spread of learning in Europe is an interesting one. It is a fact we may cheerfully acknowledge, that in the earlier centuries the attention of the Moslems was arrested and drawn toward Greek learning, and their rulers encouraged the translation of works on science and philosophy into Arabic. Greek learning, thus taken up by this new power, followed the Moslem conquerors into Spain, and thence spread into Western Europe. But more credit has frequently been given than is merited here. Two books throw a flood of light on this subject: *Documenta Philosophiæ Arabum*, by A. Smoelders: Bonnœ, 1836; and *Recherches sur anciennes traditiones d'Aristote*, by A. Jourdain. Paris. 1843. From these books many interesting facts may be learned. In the eighth century the rising Moslem power came in contact with the Nestorian schools of Mesopotamia and Persia. The Greek language was known in those countries from the time of Alexander's conquests. The Nestorian schools were famous for the subtleties of metaphysics and for scientific discussions. The Nestorians translated the principal Greek works on philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, and medicine into Arabic; or, perhaps, first into Syriac, then into Arabic. Under their Christian tutors, the Moslems—in spite of the opposition of their own orthodox doctors—made the acquaintance of Greek learning, which they carried with them to Spain. But it is a mistake to suppose that the *renaissance* in Europe is due to this movement of Islam. Some effect it most certainly had, but it must not be overrated. None of the Greek poets, orators, or historians, which have exerted so powerful an influence on Europe, were translated. Their names, even, do not seem to have been known.

The opinion that the works of Aristotle were unknown to Western Europe till made known by the Arabs, cannot be sustained. Jourdain proves by citations from Boëthius of the fifth century, that the works of Aristotle were known in Western Europe long before the Moslems came. Undoubtedly some useful discoveries were made by them; but this point

* Christian Advocate for April 12, 1877.

also has been overrated. Credit is due them for some discoveries in chemistry and the healing art. Their astronomy was that of Ptolemy. But little progress was ever made by them in mathematics. It is not likely—although generally supposed—that we are indebted to them for the system of arithmetical notation in use. These figures were known to Boëthius, and most probably were introduced from India through Egypt, and were adopted by the Arabs when they conquered Spain. Their discoveries in Algebra have been overrated. Dr. Hutton shows that their problems were anticipated by Diophantus. They had but little idea of the utility of the science. In the main the Arabs were but rude copyists, who rendered only small service in carrying science forward, and the debt of the world to Islam is not at all overwhelming. The aid given has been only incidental and temporary. Christians gave to the Moslems their first impulse toward civilization, an impulse which, after expanding for a time, subsided, and left them incapable and unprogressive from defects inherent in their system, and they soon fell into a state of intellectual decrepitude. It is the glory of Christian nations that they can claim Bacon, whose inductive laws have reconstructed the scientific world, and put investigation and progress on a true basis for all time.

A glance at the material condition of Moslem countries indicates much as to the effects of Islam on the world. Moslem countries have fallen centuries behind the progress of the age. A reign of superficial brilliancy, when conquest led the Moslem conquerors into prosperity, was soon followed by exhaustion and ruin. They wasted the countries conquered. Palestine, once a garden, is now almost a desert. Egypt has never prospered under Islam. With all her grand capacities in times of peace, her debt has accumulated at the rate of $30,000,000 for ten years past. "Turkey comprises within its limits the ancient Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor, Thrace, and Macedonia, once teeming with population, threaded with solidly-built roads, dotted thickly with cities and harbors, and supporting with ease the wars of Alexander, of his successors, and of the Lower Empire of the Khalifs of Baghdad. Now barely £4,000,000 a year is squeezed out of it; not a decent road exists in the country save what has been made by

the hated Franks on borrowed capital." * Sir H. Rawlinson says, "In the hands of the Turk the country never will improve, for the faith of Islam is incompatible with civilization." Palgrave, always appreciative of any thing good in Islam, says, "Transient vigor, followed by long and irremediable decay, is the general history of Mohammedan Governments and races." Again, "When the Koran and Mecca shall have disappeared from Arabia, then, and then only, can we seriously expect to see the Arab assume a place in the ranks of civilization, from which Mohammed and his book have, more than any other individual cause, long held him back." †

In India, where Islam has had a development grander than its most magnificent era in Spain, we meet with only decadence and material collapse. A vast and relentless parasite, Islam in time consumed to ruin the resources of a country almost boundless in capacity. Under Moslem rule there was but little incentive to accumulate property, for it was liable to be seized or exorbitantly taxed by Government. People lived in a state of fear and uncertainty. Females dared not to put on jewelry through fear of attracting the avarice of an incapable Government or of high-handed robbers. The English Government could well anticipate an increase of thirty-two per cent. of revenue in a very few years, in a state of security under their rule, when they took the country. Lands that sold for a few hundred rupees under Moslem rule, now sell for more thousands twice told. The Province of Oude, which under Hindu rule teemed with a thrifty population, under Moslem rule lost many inhabitants. Often the oppressed cultivator would escape across the Ganges to British territory under a shower of bullets. In the few years since the English have annexed Oude population has increased, and the price of land has more than doubled. All these facts bear testimony against the system we are passing under review.

Islam, like Judaism, is an anachronism; but, unlike Judaism, we cannot admit for it the divine sanction. It is a rude plagiarism from that system, preserving but little of its virtues, incorporating much that is fatal to morality and progress. It is essentially barbarism, incapable of keeping pace with true

* Calcutta Review for January, 1874. † "Central Arabia."

progress, and from its nature incapable of reform. Its founder was a deceiver—possessing, no doubt, some virtues, but whose character and career must for all time expose him to the grave charge of *imposture*, and call upon him the reprehension of mankind; while the system that he promulgated, and with which he has enslaved and degraded and demoralized millions of the race, must, in spite of some good claimed for it, continue to merit the disapprobation of those who represent the far nobler light which Islam seeks to put out in darkness. Only the Omniscient knows just what the fate of this system is to be. But with the Russian pressing it on the north, and England circumscribing and encroaching on it on the east, and Europe on the west, tearing from it country after country, no wonder that it instinctively and cunningly seeks an outlet and new lease of life southward in the vast continent of Africa. If the Christian missionaries are true to their colors a conflict must come there also. Patience and forbearance and charity we must have, but there can be no compromise with the false prophet. Civilization, too, must encounter here this barbarism of the Arabian desert. Thus begirt and pressed by the advancing Christian powers—inflexible—bigoted—defiant, its end is a problem unsolved. The stirring events around Constantinople, its political head, indicate a crisis. God rules among the nations.

---

## Art. II.—CITY METHODISM.*

The *status* of Methodism in large cities, about which there has been so much discussion lately, is not a new question either to American or English Methodists. The careful reader of our denominational press in late years might have supposed that the prevailing sentiment of the Church was that city Methodism had fallen seriously behind country Methodism in vigor and relative growth. As much as this was admitted against Methodism in London, in 1870, by The Methodist Recorder. This paper stated that while the Wesleyans were more numerous in the

* For convenience' sake the word "Methodism" is applied throughout this article to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that only.

whole of England than either the Congregationalists or the Baptists, they had in London only half as many ministers and chapels as the former, and were outnumbered considerably by the latter. When such an admission was made for the great English metropolis, where the first Methodist chapel in the world was opened, and when our own denominational press was asking what should be done to give us "commanding influence in the cities," * and to fill up the appealing (?) array of empty pews which many of our city Churches present," † it would have been natural to infer that the *status* of Methodism in cities was by no means considered a satisfactory one.

When, however, The Independent, in February last, set out to show by certain statistical comparisons what is the exact *status* of Methodism in our large cities, the Methodist press began a vigorous defense against the statements and conclusions advanced. This may have been done to bring out all the facts bearing upon the subject of controversy; if so, the opponents may be expected in good time to accept all that has been conclusively demonstrated. Nothing more than this is asked; nothing more expected. It has been hinted that The Independent has been governed by a selfish motive in what it has done, desiring to strengthen the Congregational denomination by the disintegration of the Methodist Episcopal Church through the abolition of the itinerancy. It may be that to this belief is due the sharpness of some of the criticisms which have been made upon its work. However this may be, the imputation is unjust. The articles were inspired by no other motive than the desire to do a service to the Methodist Episcopal Church. If the truth has been set forth in good spirit no unworthy motives can justly be attributed to that paper. The truth should always be welcome to us. As a Methodist layman, whose religious opinions and sympathies are heartily Methodistic, I do not consider it at all disgraceful or damaging to the Church to admit all that is charged against city Methodism. No one Church can rightly claim to combine with the peculiar excellences of its own those of all other ecclesiastical systems.

If we have had an unequaled success in rural districts, where the Protestant Episcopal Church has undoubtedly made a com-

* The Methodist, 1870. † Zion's Herald, 1876.

parative failure, it is more to the credit and glory of Methodism than if it had specially sought out the rich and cultured classes, and neglected those less favored. In this, our Church has been following in the footsteps of the Master, who chose his followers not from among the wealthy and learned, but from the ranks of the poor and uncultured; and his work was chiefly among this class. Though American Methodism began its existence in a city, it soon took root in the country, where it found congenial and fruitful soil, and thousands upon thousands of souls were gathered into its societies who but for its agency might never have known the second birth. Here again did it follow the example of Christ, who did not confine his labors to Jerusalem. Its polity, and its plain, practical, pentecostal preaching, were admirably suited to the times and people, and it won success because it deserved it. If Methodism, absorbed with its God-given mission to the country populations, failed to cultivate the city field with as much success relatively as it obtained outside of it, it need not now be ashamed of its record. But it is surely time to inquire what the real facts are, and what must be done to strengthen, if necessary, our position and influence in the cities. What, if any thing, prevents us from increasing our strength and influence in them? Is our polity adapted to the highest success in urban fields?

These are questions which it can do the Church no harm to consider. I do not understand that it is claimed that our polity and methods are absolutely perfect; I *do* understand that it is claimed that our ecclesiastical system has been developed providentially and gradually; and I am not among those who believe that Providence has nothing more to suggest in the direction of improvement. There ought not to be, it seems to me, two opinions among Methodists on the question of ascertaining all the facts respecting the success or want of success of Methodism in cities, and the efficiency of the probationary system. To throw light upon the former subject was the object of the discussion started last year. What was said about probationers, until the appearance of Mr. Atkinson's article in the July number of this REVIEW, was merely incidental.

As the evident purpose of Mr. Atkinson's article is to answer and overthrow The Independent's statements and conclusions, it will be first in order to ascertain what that journal set out to

do. It is not improbable that the sense in which the phrase, "comparative failure," was used has not been rightly understood. The word "failure," even when qualified by the adjective "comparative," conveys a strong meaning, and may have led some to suppose that it was intended to humiliate Methodism, by denying that it had done any thing in cities worthy of mention. I do not know, however, of any phrase which would have better fitted the facts. The meaning which it was intended the phrase should convey was carefully guarded. The phrase, as stated at the beginning, was not used to mean that Methodism "has no strength or standing" in the cities. The idea intended to be conveyed was, that it was "not an absolute, but a comparative failure." What other words could be used to describe so accurately the facts set forth—those facts being that relatively to the population, Methodism is but little more than half as strong in the leading cities as in the country? The proposition was that "Methodism is a comparative failure in cities," and it was sought to establish it—

First, by a comparison of Methodism in the great cities with Methodism in the country; and, second, by showing that city Methodism, as compared with country Methodism, was far less successful than either city Presbyterianism, as compared with country Presbyterianism, or city Episcopalianism, as compared with country Episcopalianism.

It will be seen that this offer of proof does not include the simple comparison of Methodism with Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism. Not a word was said at any time about the simple numerical ascendency, although the table given in the first article, as a starting point, showed that the Methodists were outnumbered by the other two denominations; but the correction of an error, in the next article, placed our Church at the head of the list. Such a comparison would have proved nothing in this case, except that Methodism was not an absolute failure in cities—a charge which was disclaimed at the outset. The degree of numerical success achieved by Methodism in cities could not have been ascertained in this way. The proposition would have been established, however, by proving that city Methodism has seriously fallen behind country Methodism. But if the comparison had been carried no farther it might have been argued that the other denominations, confronted by

the same obstacle—the large and "inaccessible" foreign-born element—were doing no better, relatively. Therefore, Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism were brought into the comparison—the former as an example of a Church achieving nearly the same degrees of success in both city and country, and the latter as an instance of the attainment of a high degree, relatively, of success in cities.

Seven of the largest cities were taken for the statistical exhibit, and when it was objected that the basis was not broad enough, eighteen more were added, the twenty-five embracing all having a population of fifty thousand and upwards. With the seven cities, it was shown that while twenty-nine thousand of the country population produce one thousand Methodist members, it requires forty-six thousand of city population to produce the same number. On the basis of the twenty-five cities a similar result was obtained. Going further, in order to meet objections against the large foreign element in the population of the cities, it was also proved that, excluding it from both the country and the twenty-five cities, twenty-four thousand of the American-born population in the country produce one thousand Methodists, while thirty-two thousand of the same class of city population are required to produce the same number.

If it was Mr. Atkinson's design to overthrow these statements, he should, it seems to me, have met them carefully, and shown where the errors (if any) lay, and why (if such were the fact) the proofs were insufficient. But he has made no allegations against the correctness and sufficiency of either the matter or manner of proof. There is only an implied impeachment of these in his statistical work. He has taken a different basis for his calculations—that of the cities (fourteen in number) having 100,000 population and upwards, but he has assigned no reason for it. What I now purpose is an examination of the statistics which he offers to warrant his conclusion that Methodism is as successful in cities as in the country.

His proposition is to "demonstrate by unimpeachable proof" that Methodism has "shown equal adaptation to both" city and country. The first proof he offers is the numerical ascendency of Methodism in the cities over Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, etc. This is a fact which has never been denied, but its force as a

proof of the proposition is not apparent to me. His second mode of proof is a comparison of city with country Methodism; but he does not make relative comparisons with Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism. His total of Methodist communicants for the fourteen cities is 102,351. This includes 13,650 probationers; but as this comparison is confined to Methodism itself, the result is the same whether they are included or not. The objection to them as not being members may, therefore, be waived here. He says that "the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the fourteen cities are $2\frac{47}{100}$ per cent. of the population, or about one in forty," and that outside of them the ratio is one communicant to about twenty-two inhabitants. There is in these statements an unmistakable admission that The Independent's proposition is true. There is no ground in them for any other conclusion. The admission is, substantially, that applying to the cities the ratio of Methodist communicants to country population, city Methodism falls short nearly one half. All that is said about the large "inaccessible" foreign population of the cities can in no wise affect the judgment which must be rendered upon the question, Has Methodism succeeded as well in the cities as it has in the country? The "inaccessible" argument is only admissible as a plea in mitigation. The cities must be taken as they are, foreign population and all. If Methodism cannot reach this foreign element it is not adapted to cities, because this element forms a very large proportion of their population. I believe, on the contrary, that Methodism can and does reach this class. We are constantly winning converts of all nationalities, and from Roman Catholic, Jewish, and other religions. There are many such converts in our ministry. Our work among the foreign populations of the United States has attained to large proportions. Of the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church one in every nineteen speaks a foreign language; and who can tell the number of those of foreign birth or parentage, and using the English tongue, who are returned as Methodist members? Nor should it be forgotten that the Church has been greatly strengthened by immigrants from Great Britain and Europe. We have many useful and some prominent men in our pulpits who are of foreign birth. I certainly believe that Methodism is adapted to all peoples. The Presbyterian Church (without considering

the foreign element) does fully as well among the city as it does among the country people, and why should not the Methodist? The Protestant Episcopal Church is almost thrice as successful in the city as it is in the country, while Methodism is not much more than half as strong relatively in the former as it is in the latter. If we take Mr. Atkinson's statistics for the fourteen cities as a basis, we shall find that the relative standing of the three denominations in city and country is as follows:—

| Church. | Ratio in Country. | Ratio in City. |
|---|---|---|
| Protestant Episcopal | 1 in 164 | 1 in 58 |
| Presbyterian | 1 in 57 | 1 in 53 |
| Methodist Episcopal | 1 in 22 | 1 in 40 |

These figures I believe to represent fairly the relative position of each Church. The Methodist statistics here include probationers. If the probationers were left out the Methodist ratio would be 46 in the cities, and correspondingly smaller in the country.

Now, the result arrived at by The Independent on the basis, first, of seven cities, and, second, on that of twenty-five, was—in cities 1 Methodist *member* to every 46 of the population, in the country 1 to every 29. Taking Mr. Atkinson's figures—88,701 *members* in the fourteen cities, and dividing the number into the population of those cities—4,130,000—a result is obtained of 46. The same ratio holds good, therefore, whether seven, fourteen, or twenty-five cities be taken as a basis.

Passing now to Mr. Atkinson's statistical comparison of city with country Methodism, I beg, in order to do him no injustice, to quote that part of his article in full:—

> After subtracting the foreign-born population of the fourteen cities from the total foreign-born population of the United States, we have remaining 4,094,482. The foreign-born population of the fourteen cities, as we have seen, is over 35 per cent. of the entire population of those cities; while the foreign-born population outside of these cities is to the total population of the United States exclusive of them—which is 34,426,094—in the ratio of $11\frac{1}{8}$ per cent., or considerably less than one eighth. The communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the fourteen cities are $2\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. of the population, or, about 1 in 40. But more than half of the population, as we have shown, is inaccessible to Methodism, consequently the real proportion is about *one communicant to twenty of the population*. Exclusive of the four-

teen cities the ratio to the population is $4\frac{41}{100}$ per cent., or, about *one Methodist Episcopal communicant to twenty-two inhabitants.*

It is to be regretted that Mr. Atkinson did not give his mathematical operations at this point more in detail. That he has made a mistake is evident, but whether the error lies in failing to deduct the total population of the cities, or the foreign element outside the cities, from that of the whole country, cannot be certainly determined. There is no doubt that such an error has been committed. This will make it plain:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Population of the United States | 38,558,371 |
| Population of the fourteen cities | 4,130,000 |
| Foreign-born outside cities | 4,094,482—8,224,482 |
| Total | 30,333,889 |

Now 30,333,889÷1,548,600 (the number of communicants outside the cities)=19—a very different result from that which Mr. Atkinson obtained. By adding either the population of the cities, or the number of foreign-born inhabitants outside the cities to the dividend—30,333,889—the quotient will be increased to 22. By an oversight, therefore, Mr. Atkinson made a more favorable exhibit for city Methodism than the facts warrant. My supposition is, that notwithstanding the words "exclusive of the fourteen cities," etc., he deducted the foreign-born population, and not that of the cities, because he actually makes that subtraction in a preceding sentence. But not only did he err in this, but also as to the children of the foreign-born population outside the cities. In addition to the 1,472,000 of foreign-born people in the fourteen cities, he deducts 15 per cent. for their children, "who," he says, "like their parents, are generally hostile to evangelical Protestantism." The number of these children is, therefore, 593,000, which is one child to every 2·46 of the foreign-born parents. Now, if such allowance is to be made for the children of foreign-born parents in the cities, where they are as generally employed in Protestant families as the same class can be in the country, it ought also to be made for the children of foreign parentage outside the cities. The argument applies with as much force to the country as to the cities. There is, then, 1,651,000 more to be deducted for children of foreign parents in the country, which reduces the dividend to 28,682,889, and, consequently, the

X 706370



quotient to 18. Now, if the Methodist Episcopal Church does as well among the American-born population of the fourteen cities as it does among the same population outside them, it will have 114,722 communicants in them. It has, in fact, 102,351, which includes several thousand foreign-born communicants. If these be taken out the deficiency will, of course, be much larger. This is the most favorable exhibit that can be made for city Methodism. Having taken out half the population of the fourteen largest cities in the United States, it is found that in them our Church falls behind itself in the country 10 per cent. Taking the country and cities as they stand, (without deductions,) the Church falls behind in the latter 45 per cent. The facts in regard to the foreign-born population of the fourteen cities are, that, comparing the census of 1870 with that of 1860, it will be found that of the total increase of these cities in that period, about 283,000 belongs to the foreign-born population, and about 873,000 to the American-born. The proportion to the whole population of the foreign-born inhabitants in these cities is considerably smaller than it was in 1860. Then the foreign element comprised 40 per cent. of the total population; now it comprises 36.

Much has been said, as an offset to the criticisms made on city Methodism, about the peculiar difficulties the Church has had to contend with. Other Churches were here before the Methodist and preoccupied the ground. That is true, yet American Methodism is more than one hundred and ten years old, and it does not require a century in a free country like this, with no entanglement of Church and State, to put all Churches on a level of opportunity. Furthermore, one hundred years ago our cities were small and comparatively insignificant. Their strength and influence have been acquired in the present century, and Methodism has had its opportunity to grow with them.* It is not as though Methodism began its race in the cities as they now exist, and under such conditions as would be imposed in this day, although a new denomination might even now find a large enough field for work in them. But if the "preoccupation" argument may be used in favor of city Methodism, it ought to have the same force when applied to country

* Of the fourteen cities, eight were incorporated in this century, four in the first quarter and four in the second.

Methodism. If it can be shown, therefore, that the latter, in any instance, has advanced against the same obstacle—preoccupation—more rapidly than the former has, the argument will be robbed of its force as an excuse for city Methodism. For this purpose let us take Massachusetts. I do not know of a stronger case. Every one, I am sure, will concede that the towns and villages of that State were as largely "preoccupied" by the Congregational and other denominations as were any of the cities; furthermore, Methodism in New York and Baltimore has had the advantage of a quarter of a century in age over itself in Massachusetts. Yet it has found opportunity to establish itself in that State. Leaving out Boston, I find that one in every thirty-one of the population of the State is a Methodist communicant. Comparing Methodism in Massachusetts with Methodism in New York city we have this result: In Massachusetts there is 1 communicant to every 31 of the population; in New York 1 to 76. Here is a difference against city Methodism of 59 per cent. We see, therefore, that the "preoccupation" argument will not explain the weakness of Methodism in New York city. The same argument could be pleaded as effectually for country Methodism in nearly all the seaboard States as it can for Massachusetts. As another illustration of the weakness of the arguments advanced in behalf of city Methodism Baltimore may be used. This has always been regarded as a Methodist city, in which Methodist strength and influence are far in advance of those of any other Protestant denomination. It has there had a fair chance, "preoccupying" the ground itself, and having a comparatively small foreign element to narrow its field. Now let us see how Methodism in this Methodist city compares with country Methodism as found in the State to which Baltimore belongs. The latter has a population of 267,354, and, according to Mr. Atkinson, 17,007 communicants. The population of the State, leaving out Baltimore, is 513,540, and the number of communicants outside Baltimore, as nearly as I can ascertain, 50,450. The ratio, therefore, is, in Baltimore 1 communicant to every 16 of the population; and outside Baltimore, 1 to every 10. As the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has only 1,432 members in Baltimore, while it must have a larger number relatively outside the city, it does no injustice to Baltimore Meth-

odism not to include the statistics of that Church. Taking out the foreign-born element in both city and country, and likewise from the communicants, I find that the result is: in Baltimore, 1 communicant in every 13 of the American-born population; and outside Baltimore 1 in every 9—a difference of 30 per cent. against the city.

I have yet another case to bring forward. It will not be denied, I presume, that our Church has had an equal opportunity with other Protestant denominations to go up and possess Chicago. Methodism was over 650,000 strong when Chicago was incorporated, in 1837, with 4,170 inhabitants. If the methods and polity of Methodism are adapted to cities, as they unquestionably are to the country, we shall be justified in looking for a high degree of success in Chicago. But it will appear that, whatever may be the cause, our Church is weak in the city, as compared with its great strength in the State. We have in Illinois, if I have made no mistake, (I have gathered the figures from nine conferences,) about 124,000 communicants. Outside of Chicago the total is 117,707, which is in the proportion of 1 communicant to every 19 of the population. In Chicago the proportion is 1 to every 47. Chicago Methodism, therefore, falls behind Illinois Methodism about 59 per cent. Subtracting the foreign-born population from both city and State, and also leaving out the foreign communicants, the result is: in Chicago 1 communicant to every 33 of the American born population, and outside Chicago 1 in every 17, showing that Methodism in Chicago is about 48 per. cent. behind itself in the State even on this basis. Further than this, I do not believe that Chicago Methodism is very vigorous or enterprising. It is certainly not growing with the city; for, while the latter has multiplied its population (from 1840 to 1870) by about 60, Methodism has multiplied itself in the same period by only 26. In 1840 1 in every 32 was a Methodist; in 1870 the proportion was 1 in every 74. The difference between this last result, 74, and the former, 47, is owing to the fact that in the first instance Methodist statistics for 1876 are given, but the city population is that of the census of 1870. This fact affects Methodism favorably in all the other cities, the Methodist statistics of 1876 being compared with the population of 1870.

Now what are the facts concerning the "preoccupation" of

New York city, which had a population of about 16,000 when Methodism first entered it? In 1785 it had in all nine Churches, the strongest of which were probably the Reformed Dutch, which cared principally for the Dutch. How many Presbyterians there were I have not been able to ascertain, but the Protestant Episcopal Church could not have been very strong, for it had only five clergymen in the whole State. In New York, as elsewhere, that Church suffered terribly during the Revolutionary War. Trinity Church, in New York city, was burned, and outside Philadelphia Episcopal worship could scarcely be maintained, such was the feeling against the English Church. Peace found its Churches disorganized and going to pieces, and it was not until after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the Protestant Episcopal Church began its career as an organized denomination. It had, however, a social prestige which Methodism could not boast of for at least half a century after the rise of the latter in America. Another explanation of the slow rate of increase of city Methodism is that the cities—New York especially—are passing into the possession of foreign-born people, and that, in consequence, native Americans are moving out of them into the country. In this way, as some think, New York city Methodism has suffered considerable losses. There are some facts, however, which operate against this supposition. New York city added to its population between 1860 and 1870 only 35,377 foreign-born persons out of a total increase of 128,623. In 1860 there was one person of foreign birth to every 2.12 of the population; in 1870 the proportion was one to every 2.24. Even New York is not, therefore, increasing relatively that element of its population which is regarded as "inaccessible to Protestantism."

There is a large influx into New York, and most of the other cities, of persons from all parts of the country, most of whom, at least for a while, make their homes in the city. Those who go to Brooklyn to reside are, of course, not lost to city Methodism if they be Methodists. Each of the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, has suburbs which include quite a large territory of country where those disliking residence in the heart of the city may find pleasant homes. The cities must receive large additions every year from the best of the country population, and Methodism is to be presumed to have its share

of this immigration from the rural districts. If, therefore, Methodism is constantly losing in New York and other cities by the removal of members to the rural districts, it is also constantly gaining by the stream of immigration flowing into the city from the country.

In surveying the whole ground, and giving all the weight to the defenses of city Methodism which seems to me to be due to them, I find nothing that will serve as a sufficient excuse for being satisfied with the present *status* of city Methodism. Whether we look at it from a statistical point of view, or compare its power and influence over the community with those of the leading Protestant denominations, we cannot escape the conclusion that it is much weaker than it ought to be. I do not mean to ignore what it has accomplished already; the fact that we can point to large and important results achieved in the past should give us courage to put forth larger and more intelligent efforts in the future. We can do vastly better than we have done when we shall have come to a better understanding of the nature of our difficulties.

Our present duty, it seems to me, is (1) to satisfy ourselves of the facts regarding the *status* of the Church in the cities; (2) to ascertain what are the difficulties which prevent a complete success; and, (3) to remove them. It is not my purpose now to go on to indicate what, in my opinion, these difficulties are. They can be found and better explained by older and wiser men than myself. I will content myself, in leaving this subject, with this single observation: city Churches need *pastors*.

I have already said all that I wish to on the subject named in the title of this article. The probationer question is a distinct and independent one, affecting, so far as I know, city and country Churches alike. However, as Mr. Atkinson has treated it in connection with Methodism in cities, I have no choice but to follow his example.

It ought not to be long a question with us whether the probationary system is working efficiently and beneficially, because it need not be. The statistical part of our "General Minutes" gives but one column to the probationers, and there are no means of ascertaining accurately, and from official figures, the number of probationers who are yearly lost to the Church.

But at any time the General Conference can order additional tables to be prepared, and it would then be made the duty of every pastor to report all the facts necessary to the answer of the question, What becomes of our probationers? The attention of the Church has been called to this subject more than once, and the fear has been expressed that the system causes heavy losses to the Church. There is, it seems to me, in the facts which are accessible to all, good grounds for the fear. For instance, the fact that in 1874 there were 218,432 probationers, and that the net increase of full members in the following year was only 39,063, is one of significance. What became of the other five sixths? Unfortunately, this question cannot be answered conclusively. All that we can do is to make shrewd guesses. We cannot say, with absolute certainty, that the losses occur among probationers; they may occur among members, in which case we should have a much graver evil to face. It seems to me that the inference to be drawn from Mr. Atkinson's statements is, that we hold our probationers, but lose our members. I am unwilling to believe that we lose about 95,000 members a year by "absence, withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters," and by expulsions. I prefer to look for the "losses" (which seem to be conceded) among the raw recruits, rather than among the veterans, but am ready to accept the truth wherever I find it.

Mr. Atkinson takes the number of probationers reported in 1875, (196,407,) and endeavors to show what became of them in 1876. He would have done better, it seems to me, to have taken a broader basis, say ten years; he would then have obtained a fair average, and not have run the risk of falling upon an exceptional case. Now, having taken the number of probationers reported in 1875, Mr. Atkinson had to ascertain, first, what the net increase of members was in 1876; and, second, what losses the total membership sustained by death and otherwise. The net increase he found was about 38,000, and the deaths (of members) numbered 18,830; then he estimated, on the basis of the statistical report of the Congregational denomination for 1876, that 4,500 were expelled, and that 90,000 were lost to the Church "by absence, withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters." Footing these up, he found that he had accounted for 151,330 of the 196,407 probationers, and had

45,077, or 23 per cent., left. Of this number many, in his opinion, would be ultimately received into the Church.

This would be an excellent showing for the probationary system if it were correct, but there are errors in it which rob it of its value. The chief of these is based on a misunderstanding of the Congregational statistics. The number of Congregational members, 45,033, reported absent in 1876, represents not merely the absentees of that year; "most of them are of long standing, that is, from one to ten years' standing."* This is not merely my own supposition; the words quoted are from the compiler of the statistics, and are, therefore, conclusive. He further says that there may have been 5,000 new absentees in 1876, but there are no means of verifying this estimate. It is fair to assume, however, that if ten years produce 45,033 absentees, one year will produce 4,500. If we take 5,000, therefore, as the number of absentees in 1876, we make a liberal allowance. With 5,000 as a basis, we shall reach a result very different from that which Mr. Atkinson obtains. Let us revise his estimates. The item "expelled" may be stricken out altogether, because the number is very small, and must be more than equaled by the accessions from other Churches. Now we have—

| | |
|---|---|
| Increase of full members | 38,000 |
| Deaths | 18,830 |
| Losses occasioned by withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters, say | 20,000 |
| Deaths of probationers | 2,709 |
| Total of new members in 1876 | 79,539 |
| Number of probationers in 1875 | 196,407 |
| Number of probationers unaccounted for | 116,877 |

It will be observed that I have multiplied the number of Congregational absentees (5,000) by four because our denomination is about four times as large as the Congregational. Mr. Atkinson multiplied the same item by two; I am, therefore, doing no injustice to his side of the case. Furthermore, I have added 2,709 for deaths among the probationers, using to obtain these figures the ratio which the deaths reported in the "Minutes" bear to the number of members.

* From a letter to the writer from the Rev. Dr. C. Cushing, editor of The Congregational Quarterly.

The above table shows that of the 196,407 probationers reported in 1875 only about 80,000, or 40 per cent., became members in 1876. There remain unaccounted for at the end of 1876 over 116,000 probationers, minus the number that were dropped during the year. Mr. Atkinson's estimate left 23 per cent. unaccounted for, but many, he believed, would hold over to 1877. If we say that 20 per cent. of the 196,407 hold over to 1877, we are dealing very liberally with his argument. 20 per cent. of 196,407 is 39,000, and 116,000—39,000 =77,000, which would appear to be the number of probationers who are lost. But there are two other facts to be taken into consideration. Mr. Atkinson, probably, does not hold that the 90,000 which he sets down for absentees, and those retaining letters, are a total and final loss to the Church, because absentees and those retaining letters do return and present themselves or their letters to pastors. There must, therefore, have been absentees, etc., of former years who returned in 1876, and helped to increase the number of members; but he has forgotten to make any use of them in his table. He also neglected to make an estimate of those who became members within the conference year and were never represented in the column of probationers in the Annual "Minutes." How much of the increase of members in 1876 was due to this item it would be hard to determine. We are justified, however, in estimating it to be quite large, because if the probationary system works efficiently the majority will be received into full membership at the close of the regular term of six months. Many of those, therefore, who enter upon the probationary relation within the first six months of the conference year may be received into full membership before the close of the year. As half of the conferences meet in the fall and half in the spring, it will be readily seen how thousands of new members may be received in the conference year without ever being reported as probationers. When this fact is applied to the problem before us it, of course, enlarges the number of probationers, and consequently the disproportion between the probationers and the new members.

Although, as the result of an extended investigation of the whole subject, I am led to the conclusion that it is utterly impossible, without more official data, accurately to answer the

question, "What becomes of our probationers?" I am satisfied that Mr. Atkinson's estimate that 77 per cent. of our probationers are received into full membership is much too high. I do not think that the revised table which I have offered, estimating the losses at about 40 per cent., is unfair to the probationary system, yet I will not put it forward as a solution of the problem. I fear that the actual facts, if they were known, would be less favorable to the system than are my estimates.* My main purpose in writing these pages is to point out the errors Mr. Atkinson has made, and to make it reasonably certain that, whether from the defects of the system or from the lax administration of pastors, or from a combination of both, an alarmingly large proportion of our probationers never become members of the Church. It is a matter which the General Conference should consider at its next session.

---

## Art. III.—EDUCATION AMONG THE FREEDMEN.

Every body remembers the *dictum* of the plantation, to the effect that the negro was of so inferior a capacity as not to admit of his education, and that any attempt to train him up in the ways of civilization would always be a failure. It was known that this was an interested opinion, but it gained such large credence among intelligent people that, when the extraordinary case of Benjamin Banneker was brought to the knowledge of Mr. Jefferson, in 1791, he accepted the facts as going a long way to prove the contrary.

Banneker was born of free parents in Maryland, at Ellicott's Mills, not far from Baltimore. After reaching the age of manhood he learned to read, and from that starting-point advanced rapidly in such knowledge as was within the reach of a poor man who bore the brand of an enslaved race. He had great skill in the use of tools, great power of invention, and was a profound and accurate observer. In 1787 George Ellicott,

* Since writing this article I have seen the Newark Conference Minutes for 1876, which state, that of 3,322 probationers on 149 charges in 1875, only 1,372 became members in 1876. A fair calculation shows that 48 per cent. were lost.

noticing his genius, furnished him with a variety of works on astronomy, which he devoured with avidity and put to practical use. He made a clock, and other instruments, to help him in his astronomical researches, and in 1791 brought out an Almanac, which was published annually in Baltimore till his death, in 1804.

Banneker sent the manuscript of his first Almanac to Mr. Jefferson, with a manly letter, to which the Virginia statesman made prompt reply. In it he said:—

> Nobody wishes more than I do to see such proofs as you exhibit that nature has given to our black brethren talents equal to those of the other colors of men, and that the appearance of the want of them is owing only to the degraded condition of their existence, both in Africa and America.

Before closing he says:—

> I have taken the liberty to send your Almanac to Monsieur de Condorset, Secretary of the Academy of Sciences at Paris and Member of the Philanthropic Society, because I consider it a document to which your whole color has a right, for their justification against the doubts which have been entertained of them.

But there were very few, especially in the South, who shared Mr. Jefferson's power of abstracting himself from present interests and prejudices, and recognizing the capabilities of a race in the examples of its highest types. And at a later period, when the discussions in relation to slavery grew intense and fierce, and local prejudices were more and more excited, it became the general doctrine of those who defended the "divine institution" that slavery was the normal condition of the negro, and that he was doomed to it because of his incapacity to be educated and to stand on the same general plane as the Anglo-Saxon. Hence, when the war broke out and the escaped slaves came rushing to our camps in their poverty and helplessness, and their first cry was for a spelling-book and for the aid of some one who could teach them to read it, there was a genuine feeling of amazement, not only throughout the South, but, in a less degree, throughout the North.

We had been accustomed to see immigrants from all the nations of the old world flock to our shores, mostly of the proud white races, but destitute of the elements of learning, and not at all anxious to improve their mental condition. Especially

had we seen great armies of Celts come to us from old, historic Ireland, lying under the shadow of the British crown, but coming with no aspirations after learning, and neither seeking for educational help nor allowing it to be thrust upon them. Of all the ignorant millions that have thus found homes on the shores of America, the adults who have put out their hands for books and have sought instruction in letters could almost be counted on your fingers. The children have been pretty uniformly admitted to our schools, but the adults have seldom had the perseverance necessary to acquaint themselves with the elements of learning.

But as soon as our armies of invasion found a lodgment at Port Royal, and at Hampton, and along the valley of the Mississippi, the slaves that were taken by force, or that came stealthily to our camps to escape from their life-long oppression, manifested the strongest desire to understand that mystery by which the white man was able to talk with his book. General Eaton, now the enterprising head of our Bureau of Education, who was placed in charge of all the "contrabands" in the valley of the Mississippi, amounting before the close of the war to perhaps a hundred thousand, informed the writer that nearly all of them furnished themselves with spelling-books as one of their first acquirements; and at any moment of their leisure they would drop down on a stone or log, and, drawing out the book from its hiding-place, would con over the mysterious combinations which were the key to that greater volume of knowledge which they desired to open.

But there was another element in the process of lifting up this down-trodden race not less remarkable than their own avidity to learn. It is not often that the world has seen one race, with a high civilization, take by the hand another race, of a low civilization, and seek to elevate it to its own level; but that is about what took place after the inauguration of the late war, when the escaped "contrabands" appealed to us for protection and aid. Progress in civilization has generally been through the slow process of experience. Men, profiting by their own failures and successes, have, in the course of slow centuries, grown gradually into better conditions without much extraneous aid; and it is a new thing, due probably to a better conception of Christian character, for a whole people to stretch

out a helping hand to the rescued slave, and to thrust on him the appliances for a sudden development in all the letters and arts of their own high estate.

This is a fact of amazing significance; and the wonderful activity of the Christian world—Methodists, Congregationalists, Churchmen, Presbyterians, Quakers, Unitarians—from the moment that access could be had to the released slaves, shows more, perhaps, than the religious formulas of the sanctuary, how truly these Christian philanthropists were moved by that Spirit of the divine Master which is expressed in the words, "Freely ye have received: freely give." Their earnest impulse expressed itself in a generous outflow of money and means, as marked as the enthusiasm of the Crusaders, while it had a practical object that made every blow struck result in furthering the process of redemption and development.

As an example of this wonderful activity we turn, first, to the national capital. The District of Columbia had been set off from Maryland, and it was the boast of the revolting States that the city of Washington was on slave territory and surrounded by slave territory. But the representatives of the Southern States had scarcely withdrawn from Congress when it was proposed to emancipate the District slaves, and the act for that purpose went into effect on April 16, 1862. The District then became free territory, and Washington was soon a city of refuge for all the escaped slaves of the surrounding States; and it did not take long to discover that here was a field for patient, persistent, philanthropic Christian work.

The country was then under the strain of the great civil war, and the energies of the North were taxed as they had never been taxed before; but there was no attempt to shirk this new burden, which was borne with a manly strength that savored neither of exhaustion nor fatigue. The increased demands on the Departments, caused by the war, had filled them with an army of clerks fresh from their homes in the North, many of whom were earnest Christian workers, who volunteered their services for evening schools, and benevolent individuals organized day schools and called on their friends to furnish money for their support. An orphans' home was organized for homeless and parentless children; hospitals were established for the sick, in which the spelling book was a part of the medical treat-

ment; and a bewildering multitude of societies, organized for benevolent objects, sent their agents down from the Northern and Western cities to look over the ground and see if there was any remaining want that their energy or resources could supply.

The Emancipation Act took effect in the middle of April, and in the following March the American Tract Society of New York had its agents on the ground, who held a meeting in Duff Green's Row, on Capitol Hill, then crowded with escaped negroes who were held as captured material of war. Rev. H. W. Pierson, for some time President of Cumberland College, Ky., but then in the service of the Tract Society, called the meeting, and there were present some sixty men, women, and children, fresh from Virginia plantations, all eager to learn. Mr. Pierson taught them with printed cards, on which were verses of Scripture in large letters, and he was very successful in gaining their attention and making his first impression.

Then followed a succession of crude efforts in the same direction, by a great variety of influences, growing gradually into a regular and permanent work, but scattered in camps and hospitals, warehouses and colored churches, and at a later period in the villages established for freedmen at Arlington (across the Potomac) and beyond Uniontown, across the Eastern Branch. The school at Freedmen's Village, in the autumn of 1863, was, probably, the most conspicuous example of a genuine school for contraband children, fresh from the plantation, that had then been given to the world. Through the summer the refugees had dwelt there in tents and hovels, or had made their homes under the shelter of some friendly tree or straggling fence; but as the cold weather approached a number of comfortable dwellings were erected by the Government, and also a large but rough building for a school, in which were gathered, at the opening, some two hundred and fifty children, to be soon increased to four hundred. It was conducted by H. E. Simmons and his wife, and attracted the attention of visitors to Washington from all parts of the United States. Mr. Seward and his daughter, Fannie, were constant visitors, and in his visits the Secretary of State was accustomed to take with him foreign ministers and distinguished visitors from abroad, to give them a practical demonstration of the

capacities of the negro in his lowest and most undeveloped condition. The school was a great success from the first, and not only Mr. Seward and his friends, but Secretary Chase, and many Senators and Representatives, were frequent observers of its progress.

But it is not possible in the scope of this article to individualize these various efforts. In the cool months of 1863 and 1864 the various relief associations had under their charge twenty-six schools, with sixty-one teachers and two thousand six hundred and fifty scholars, as is more fully shown by the following table, which we copy from an article published in the First Report of the Commissioner of Education, Henry Barnard, prepared by M. B. Goodwin, Esq. It shows at a glance the part borne in this work at its beginning by the different associations :—

SCHOOLS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS IN 1863, 1864.

| | Schools. | Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Freedmen's Relief Association, Dist. Columbia. | 5 | 11 | 500 |
| American Tract Society, N. Y. | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| African Civilization Society | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| Reformed Presbyterian Mission, (one night school) | 2 | 4 | 200 |
| Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association | 1 | 2 | 150 |
| Philadelphia Friends' Freedmen's Relief Association | 1 | 2 | 150 |
| Dr. L. P. Johnson (one night school) | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Trustees of Colored Public Schools | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| Volunteer Teachers' Association (night schools) | 12 | 34 | 1,250 |
| | 26 | 61 | 2,650 |

The years went on, but the demands for this work did not diminish. In April, 1865, the war was brought to a close, and during the course of the spring and summer the army was disbanded and the camps about Washington broken up; but the city still continued to be a refuge for the emancipated slaves, and as there was more regularity in their modes of living, the change was favorable for the work of education. The schools increased in number and efficiency, and had better quarters, while the agencies through which they were maintained had somewhat changed and gathered new facilities. In the winter of 1864 and 1865 the day schools numbered twenty-nine, the teachers sixty-two, and the scholars three thousand five hundred and eighty-eight; and in the winter of 1865 and 1866 the schools

had increased to forty-two, the teachers to seventy-one, and the scholars to nearly four thousand. But in the mean time the form of the work had greatly changed. New associations had entered the field, with larger means; better accommodations were provided; there was a better supply of books, and the proficiency every-where shown was an encouragement which warranted some arrangements for permanency.

The following table, copied from the same source as the preceding one, is interesting as showing the changes that had taken place in the working force of these educational movements, and the growth and strength which some of the newly enlisted societies were evincing:—

SCHOOLS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS IN 1865, 1866.

| | Schools. | Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Assoc'n, Philadelphia.. | 9 | 17 | 858 |
| New York Freedmen's Relief Association, (N. Y.)..... | 8 | 12 | 604 |
| American Missionary Association, (N. Y.)..... | 8 | 11 | 594 |
| American Baptist Home Missionary Society, (N. Y.).... | 3 | 7 | 284 |
| Philadelphia Friends' Freedmen's Relief Association.... | 2 | 6 | 376 |
| New England Freedmen's Aid Society..... | 4 | 4 | 315 |
| New England Friends' Mission..... | 2 | 3 | 180 |
| Old School Presbyterian Mission, (Pittsburgh)..... | 2 | 5 | 373 |
| Reformed Presbyterian Mission..... | 1 | 3 | 186 |
| African Civilization Society, (N. Y.)..... | 2 | 2 | 108 |
| Bangor Freedmen's Relief Association..... | 1 | 1 | 52 |
| | 42 | 71 | 3,930 |

This does not include the school at Freedmen's Village under the charge of the American Tract Society, nor a number of private schools, nor the evening schools of the Voluntary Teachers' Association. It embraces only the regular day schools of the city which had now acquired some strength, and permanency.

But other influences were already at work, and resulted in great and important changes. The organization of the Freedmen's Bureau, with the vast resources at its command, and with its hand on all influences designed to advance the condition of the freedmen, had an important bearing on colored education. It did not take the work out of the hands of the societies, but in many cases it furnished buildings for the schools, often subsistence to the pupils, and sometimes funds for special school purposes. But its great educational work

was the founding of Howard University, a great central institution, with good buildings, but not so much needed now as it will be in the coming years. The Bureau, while it existed, was every-where the shield and reliance of the negro, and it expended in his behalf—sometimes wisely and sometimes not wisely—the great sum of thirteen millions of dollars.

But more important still, so far as the District of Columbia is concerned, was the action of Congress in providing for a free system of common schools, under a board of trustees which had charge of all the schools, and which in its administration treated all alike. This system was reached after various experiments, and as it advanced to maturity superseded gradually the work of the societies, which, one after another, withdrew from the field. The system, as now existing, contemplates separate schools for colored children, but with the same salaries for teachers and the same general management as the white schools. It has also connected with it a High School and a Normal School for the education of teachers. The number of schools in 1876 was seventy-six, teachers ninety, on roll four thousand five hundred pupils.

The Normal school, known as the "Miner School," is directly connected with the system of public schools, but is maintained by a separate fund, and has a history which admirably illustrates the spirit by which colored education has been achieved. It was founded by Miss Myrtilla Miner a dozen years before the war. She was a single woman of feeble health, and of an obscure family, residing in Brookfield, Madison County, New York, where she was born in 1815. Her parents were engaged in hop culture, and her early life was spent mainly in the work of the farm, and afforded little opportunity for mental culture of any kind. Her constitution was feeble from her birth, and the hard work which was laid upon her aggravated her complaints, and made her long for some lighter occupation. After arriving at womanhood she resolved to break away from home and the work of the farm, and acquire such an education as would fit her for teaching.

Mr. Seward had then just been elected Governor, and she addressed a letter to him, and received a kind and respectful answer, but without opening her way to any opportunity. Not discouraged, she applied in various other directions, and finally

entered the Manual Labor School at Clinton, but found the work beyond her strength. While there she wrote to the principal of a school in Rochester, and made such representations as induced him to offer her the advantages of his school, on a promise of payment after her studies were completed. On completing the required term at Rochester she obtained a place as governess in the family of a planter in the State of Mississippi, where she remained several years, and earned the money to discharge her obligation.

It was during her experience of plantation life that the hardships and ignorance of slavery were first made known to her, calling out occasional reproofs and protests, which she saw were not well received, and which raised suspicions and prejudices that admonished her of the necessity to look elsewhere for the means of living. The idea then first dawned on her mind that she might do something for those poor, degraded, and oppressed creatures, who had no friends and were crushed to the earth by the arm of power. Learning that there were no laws against the education of free colored people in the District of Columbia, she determined to go to Washington and open a seminary for the education of colored girls.

Of course, she had no resources of her own, but she had the confidence of some who had means, and who sympathized with the object in view; and on receiving from a Quaker in Philadelphia a gift of one hundred dollars she proceeded at once to carry into effect her contemplated enterprise. Her school for the education of colored teachers was opened in a room fourteen feet square, in the autumn of 1851; and although she was insulted and persecuted, and driven from place to place, she clung tenaciously to her purpose, and had great success. "You may tear down my house over my head," she said to a party that threatened her, "but I shall get another house. There is no law to prevent my teaching these people, and I shall teach them unto death."

But her experience soon convinced her that she must have a permanent building in some place away from the thickly settled streets; and, finding a square of ground with a building on it that would answer her purpose, for the moderate sum of four thousand dollars, she got assistance from her friends, and bought it; and there her school was continued till near the be-

ginning of the war, when it was suspended on account of her failing health. She went to California, and remained there through the war, returning in 1866, as she supposed to erect better buildings and renew her work under more favorable circumstances. But her health continued to decline, and in December, a few days after reaching Washington, she died. Her project was, however, cherished to the last, and before her death she had her square of ground—containing about three acres, and lying across the street exactly in the rear of the elegant mansion since built by the English Government for the residence of the British Minister—put in the hands of trustees, together with four thousand dollars that she had accumulated to build her house, with an injunction that it should be used to promote the education of colored teachers. The land was sold a few years ago for forty thousand dollars, and the interest has been appropriated for normal education, as she desired. But last year the trustees of the fund, one of whom was Hon. John M. Langston, our Minister to Hayti, resolved to erect a handsome building, and consecrate it to the purposes so near the heart of the heroic founder of the school. That building is just now completed, and the fund remaining will be sufficient, under the arrangements made, to defray the expenses of a first-class school. The building bears on its front the name of its revered founder, and the school is called the Miner School.*

We have occupied considerable space with these Washington schools; but as the operations at the capital are a type of what has taken place at large through all the South, the space has not been wasted. The only remaining institution which it is imperative to notice is the Wayland Seminary, a large and

* This remarkable devotion to the interests of colored education calls to mind the extraordinary benefaction of the late George Peabody. It would be difficult to conceive of any thing which would more exactly touch the great want of the South. The fund admits of the annual distribution of perhaps $100,000, at the discretion of the agent, Rev. Dr. Sears, under the advice and counsel of the distinguished men who act as trustees; and its importance consists largely in the fact that it goes where it is most needed, and where it can do most to stimulate the work of education. Sometimes the help is furnished on condition of other help, sometimes it is to colored schools, sometimes to white schools, and sometimes to promote other educational ends. It is a great and noble gift, intended to advance what Mr. Peabody saw that the South would most need after the changes made by the war; and the help that it yields is not measured by the amount distributed, whatever that may be.

flourishing school, under the care of the Baptist Church, for higher instruction. Its strength at present is in its theological department, which annually equips a large number of young men for the ministry. It occupies a handsome brick building on Meridian Hill, two miles north of the Treasury building, and is doing a splendid work.

Such is the condition of the emancipated slaves at the capital in regard to education, scarcely more than a dozen years after the war which made them free; and if the result is remarkable, it is no more remarkable than what has taken place all over the South. In dealing with education in Washington, the American Missionary Society is incidentally mentioned as having charge of eight schools, with twelve teachers and six hundred and four scholars. It was, in fact, one of the earliest and most persistent of the societies, but did not confine its work to the capital. It seems to have had a sort of mania for this educational enterprise, and wherever the harvest was ripe it thrust in its sickle.

The American Missionary Society was organized in 1846; and, as it came into being during the fierce discussions in regard to slavery that preceded the war, it took on a distinctive anti-slavery character, and was regarded as a virtual protest against the timorous and non-committal course of the American Board. Hence the home department was, from the first, conducted with a special view to preaching a gospel that was free from all complicity with slavery; and it had in 1855 one hundred and ten missionaries in Kentucky, North Carolina, and the North-western States. The history of its work in the slave States is full of romantic interest, but does not come within the scope of this article. Not so with the fact that it had very decisive antislavery tendencies, and had just got into good working order when the war broke out. For, as soon as it appeared how rich the harvest was to be, and how necessary it was to have prompt and decisive action, it withdrew its missionaries from the North-west, and concentrated the whole force of its domestic power, with largely added resources, on the field that had so unexpectedly opened in the South.

The society, thus divested of all embarrassments, was, in fact, prepared to follow the Union armies, and to plant schools wherever the escaped slaves could be protected from the marauding enterprises of the foe. In the first year of the war it

sent one of its missionaries (Rev. L. C. Lockwood) down to Fortress Monroe to look after the homeless and destitute fugitives that were then gathering in large numbers at Hampton; and the abandoned house of Ex-President Tyler was occupied for a Sunday-school on the fifteenth of September, five months after the breaking out of the war. On the day following (the sixteenth) Miss Mary S. Peake opened the first day school for freedmen that was organized in the South, and which was the harbinger of the great multitude that was soon to follow. It was something, too, that it was located on the same coast where, two hundred and forty years before, was landed that cargo of slaves which was the beginning of those oppressions which were now drawing to a close.

The next year more schools were opened at Hampton, two at Newports News, a beginning was made at Port Royal, and a missionary was sent to look after the freedmen gathered in Washington, and another to take care of the fugitives at Cairo. The proclamation of freedom came in January, 1863, and the outlook seemed to justify increased means, which were poured freely into the lap of the association, while many ladies of education and refinement volunteered to occupy the places which opened in such rapid succession.

During the course of the next summer Vicksburgh surrendered and the Mississippi was opened through its entire length, releasing a great army of slaves, and calling for teachers and missionaries at Columbus, Ky., Cairo, Ill., Memphis, Tenn., and the camps of Fisk and Shiloh.

The spring of 1865 saw the close of the war, and the organization of the Freedmen's Bureau. The association did not, however, relax its work, but put forth new energy, and had, at its various stations, 320 teachers actively employed. But now that the war was over it seemed to be necessary that temporary measures should be laid aside, and that arrangements should be made for a permanent occupation of the field; and it was seen that if the work was to be successful it must look, not so much to the masses, great as their need might be, as to the education of teachers and preachers, and the means of promoting a higher and better education, in order that the few thus taught might drop the mantle of instruction on the many that remained untaught. It was evident that if these vast hordes of ignorant slaves, now

slaves no longer, were ever to be lifted from their prison-house, they must become their own educators. Hence the importance of schools for training. The grounds of its action are forcibly stated in the report of 1876. After referring to the fact that the association cannot in the nature of things provide for the common education of the freed people, the report says:—

> Its one aim is and must be to establish at convenient points institutions to prepare Christian workers. These institutions, dotting the South, are the *ganglia*, or nerve centers, from which will radiate in every direction Christian influences. This principle is fundamental to all Christian work. It is the principle which our Lord set forth under the parable of the leaven. It is the principle which has prevailed and must prevail in every kind of missionary enterprise.—Page 10.

In pursuance of this idea this association, which during the war sought opportunity to educate all the released slaves that could be brought under its influence, now bends its efforts almost wholly to the education of "Christian workers;" and to this end has planted training schools, colleges and universities at such central points as to make them most accessible, and to give their influence the widest range. The report says:

> The association the past year has done work such as to awaken thankfulness and courage. It has now in the South seven chartered institutions of learning, fourteen high and normal schools, and six common schools—twenty-seven in all. It sustains 147 teachers and 6,175 pupils, 57 of whom are in theological training.

The effect of this wise seed-sowing has not been miscalculated. The teachers who go out from these institutions are scattered through the South, and, according to the estimate of those most familiar with the facts, now have under their care more than 70,000 pupils; while the preachers, with their greatly improved knowledge, are able to substitute for the wild and loose vagaries of the plantation a religion embracing Christian character.

We have dwelt a little on the history of this pioneer movement—not simply because it was pioneer, nor because it was an outpouring of enthusiastic enterprise, but, also, because it was a type of all that followed. It was a movement in advance, but it was not a movement alone. There was another army of Christian workers just behind it, who were not in a condition to march at the first sound of the trumpet, but who were soon on the way with strong reinforcements. It would be a pleasant

duty, and quite within the scope of this article, to deal separately with each and all of these crusading forces; but as this has already been done in an able article from the pen of Dr. Pearne, in the Quarterly for July, 1877, it is only needful to sum up the account, and show what are the results; and to do this we fall back on the article of Dr. Pearne, whose facts we condense, as follows:—

SCHOOLS OF HIGHER INSTRUCTION.

| | Pupils. | |
|---|---|---|
| **CONGREGATIONAL.** | | |
| Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va. | 243 | |
| Berea College, Berea, Ky. | 237 | |
| Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. | 212 | |
| Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga. | 240 | |
| Talladega College, Talladega, Ala. | 228 | |
| Tougaloo University, Tougaloo, Miss. | 221 | |
| Straight University, New Orleans, La. | 227— | 1,608 |
| **BAPTIST.** | | |
| Wayland Seminary, Washington, D. C. | 92 | |
| Richmond Institute, Richmond, Va. | 75 | |
| Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C. | 230 | |
| Benedict Institute, Columbia, S. C. | 118 | |
| Augusta Institute, Augusta, Ga. | 52 | |
| Nashville Institute, Nashville, Tenn. | 136 | |
| Leland University, New Orleans, La. | 92— | 795 |
| **PRESBYTERIAN.** | | |
| Biddle Memorial Institute, Charlotte, N. C. | 124 | |
| Scotia Seminary, (for girls,) Concord, N. C. | 105 | |
| Wallingford Academy, Charleston, S. C. | 261 | |
| Mainerd School, Chester, S. C. | 231 | |
| Fairfield Normal School, Winnsborough, S. C. | 184— | 905 |
| **METHODIST.** | | |
| Central Tennessee College, Nashville, Tenn. | | |
| Shaw University, Holly Springs, Miss. | | |
| Cladin University and Baker Institute, Orangeburgh, S. C. | | |
| Clarke University and Theological Institute, Atlanta, Ga. | | |
| New Orleans University and Thomson Biblical Institute. | | |
| Wiley University, Marshall, Texas. | | |
| Haven Normal School, Waynesborough, Ga. | | — 1,500 |
| Rust Biblical and Normal Institute, Huntsville, Ala. | | |
| La Teche Seminary, Baldwin, La. | | |
| Bennett Seminary, Greensborough, N. C. | | |
| Richmond Normal School, Richmond, Va. | | |
| Cookman Institute, Jacksonville, Fla. | | |
| Centenary Biblical Institute, Baltimore, Md. | | |
| Orphans' Home, Baldwin, La. | | |
| | | 4,808 |

In this last instance Dr. Pearne does not appear to have taken the pupils from the catalogues, but gives them by estimate; but accuracy is not material to our purpose. What will appear from these figures is the important fact, that in a dozen years after the war there have been planted in these States just out of rebellion more than thirty collegiate schools, in which are annually taught about 5,000 pupils, all trained, and probably all or nearly all maintained, by the Christian philanthropy of the North. This has been done against the wishes, and in many cases against the earnest protests, of the influential classes in the South. During slavery the attitude of those classes was deadly hostile to the education of the negro, and in South Carolina and some other States this was forbidden by law. The statute in South Carolina ran as follows:—

> If any person shall hereafter teach any slave to read or write, or shall aid or assist in teaching any slave to read or write, or cause or procure any slave to be taught to read or write, such person, if a free white person, upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense against this act, be fined not exceeding $100, and imprisoned not more than six months.

But whatever the law might be, the law of society was fatal to this kind of education, and it was not to be expected that the prejudices of a century would be cast off in a day. Hence Northern Christians were obliged to act on their own responsibility; and the coming ages will pronounce how courageously and how nobly they walked up to their duty. The case is well stated in the last (1876) report of the American Missionary Society, already referred to:—

> The question meets us with fearful earnestness: What can be done for the unhappy South? Education and Christianity, and they only, can solve the problem. Not education alone: not Christianity alone, (if such a thing can be,) but education and Christianity combined—an educated Christianity. It is a question worth raising, whether as a matter of self-preservation Congress should not do something for the education of the illiterate masses of the South. But we must not place our dependence on the Government. There are political difficulties in the way which render governmental help in educational directions unlikely, if not impossible. In this emergency Christian people must stand in the breach. As Christians, desiring the salvation of souls; as just men, desiring to protect those whom our own act has put in peculiar danger; as patriots, desiring a united, peaceful, and happy land, we are bound to meet these pressing needs.—Page 10.

It would be too much to expect that these great enterprises should be entirely free from selfish or denominational interests; but how remarkably free they have been would seem to be indicated by their tendency to drop into the hands of local management. All the Washington schools, organized and maintained at so much expense and labor by the various societies, have long since been relinquished and given up to the local school board of the city. The Fisk University, the proudest monument of Northern enterprise in all the South, has gone into the hands of local trustees, and also the Atlanta University in Georgia, and some others; and the Storr School in Atlanta, as is learned from the Atlanta papers, is about to be taken under the wing of the city authorities. It is evident, therefore, that, whatever secondary influences may have operated, the primary object was to redeem and lift up out of his degradation the manumitted slave.

But what would all these provisions amount to if there were not a response on the part of those who were to be benefited? The old saw says that there is no royal road to learning; and if God only helps those that help themselves, it is clear that all expenses of time and money must be in vain if there were not industry and self-denial and persistent adhesiveness on the part of the negro. It is too early as yet to know what education is to do for the negro, but it is not too early to know that he can be educated if he *will*, and that he *will* be educated. The cases of self-denial and perseverance under extraordinary circumstances of poverty and obstruction and opposition are so numerous and so striking as to be an element in those extraordinary results which we have had under review.

This work in the South has been so full of hardships that we wonder how cultivated and refined ladies could leave their pleasant homes in the North and submit to the ostracism, the alarms, and the self-denials that they had to endure. The schools were sometimes broken up by the necessary movements of the army, and the teachers obliged to seek safety in flight; sometimes they were broken up by the persecutions of the planters, or their instruments; sometimes the school-rooms were mobbed or burned; and sometimes the teachers were obliged to fly for their lives. But the work had its bright side, and the teachers clung to it because it was remunerative. The hard

penalties for seeking knowledge were removed, and the lesser penalties were not heeded. Families living in hovels and pinched with hunger came eagerly to the school-house and asked for instruction; and where there is a real want there is a real pleasure in meeting it.

These facts, therefore, answer the question as to whether the negro will be able to help himself—whether he has the perseverance and the self-denial to stand the strain which his circumstances demand to lift himself out of his present condition. But there are other facts that are equally significant, and those which cluster around the origin and development of Fisk University at Nashville are particularly impressive. Here is a large and prosperous institution, with a splendid building and a generous outfit of instructors,* built up and maintained largely by negro genius.

The beginning of this university was not unlike the beginning of many others. There was a great public want, and the university grew up to meet it. In the fall of 1865 Rev. E. P. Smith, afterward Indian Commissioner, but then in the service of the American Missionary Association, and Rev. E. M. Cravath, now President of the university, but then also in the employ of the Association, understanding the wants of the colored people about Nashville, went there to find some suitable place for opening a school, but had great difficulty in obtaining a proper location; and when one was at last found and the owner was approached in regard to it, he said, yes, it was for sale, and he wanted the money, but he "hadn't got so d—d low yet as to sell his property to educate niggers." A further search being made, it was found that an old Government hospital stood on ground that could be bought for $16,000, and as Gen. Fisk, then in the service of the Freedmen's Bu-

* The officers and instructors are as follows: President, Rev. E. M. Cravath, A.M.; Dean and Professor of Greek and French, Rev. A. K. Spence, M.A.; Professor of Theology and German, Rev. H. S. Bennett, M.A.; Professor of Latin, Miss Helen C. Morgan, M.A.; Professor of Natural Science, Rev. F. A. Chase, M.A.; Professor of Music, Theodore F. Seward; Instructor in Mathematics and History, Miss Anna M. Cahill; James D. Burrus, B.A., Instructor in Mathematics; Instructor in English Grammar and Composition, Miss Henrietta Matson; Instructor in Geography, Vocal Music, and Object Lessons, Walker G. Rappleye; Instructor in Arithmetic, Miss Elizabeth M. Barnes; Instructor in English Branches, Miss Sarah A. Stevens; Instructor in Instrumental Music, Miss Rebecca Massey.

rean, would leave the buildings for the use of the school, the purchase was made, and the Missionary Association footed the bill. Gen. Fisk entered heartily into the project, and soon the officers' quarters became the home of a band of teachers, the sick wards were fitted up as school-rooms, the dead house was converted into a store-room, and a pile of rusty hand-cuffs and fetters, bequeathed to the building as a relic of slavery, was sold and converted into spelling-books and Testaments.

The school took the name of General Fisk, a Methodist, and was a great success from the start. The average attendance the first year was over a thousand. In 1867, (the school was opened in January, 1866,) in pursuance of the new policy adopted by the association, a university charter was obtained, and rooms for boarding were extemporized; but when the school was opened under the new management there were more applicants than could obtain quarters. The pupils were all poor, and had to work their way by teaching or other labor, but they clung to their classes with wonderful tenacity, and there was much religious interest and many conversions. But, with all this prosperity, it was every day more and more obvious how unsuited the buildings were for the use of the college, and how pressing was the necessity for more room and better arrangements. The feeling of a great necessity was on all the warm hearts connected with the school, and there was much consultation and prayer, but no way seemed to open for their relief.

In the mean time music, as a part of the college exercises, had been receiving large attention, and under the inspiring instruction of the Treasurer, George L. White, Esq., a native of New York, it had become an important element in the reputation of the university. On several occasions when it was particularly desirable for the school to make a good impression Mr White's classes in music had come to the front and commanded such decided attention and such enthusiastic applause as to make it appear that there was some excellence in their training beyond the usual displays of such occasions.

Mr. White had probably not been aware of his own capacity in that regard, and the applause of these special occasions had inspired him with new confidence, and the idea began to dawn upon him that he might turn his faculty to some account for the benefit of the university. His project, as it finally took

shape, was to collect the old slave melodies of the plantation and the camp-meeting, and render them to the Northern people through his band of singers, with the hope that they would attract the same attention as a band of negro minstrels.

Of the triumphal march of the Jubilee Singers through New England and Old England; of the dollars that they coined to help on the work of education at the University; of the splendid hall which bears their name and is the monument of their genius, we need not speak, though it is a story which touches all hearts; but we should do no justice to our subject if we failed to call attention to the fact that these sweet singers, who have done so much more for the civil rights of their race than any statesman or any law—who have stood before fashionable crowds in all our large cities—who have sung to presidents and governors and cabinet officers, and have commanded the attention of princes and of royalty itself in the proudest nation of the globe, are only selections from that great mass of human merchandise which was brought out of slavery under the chastisements of Lincoln and Grant.

If we go no farther, but take the first name on the list as a type of the rest, we shall come at once into the presence of those sickening abuses which reduced four millions of people to one common level, and well-nigh extinguished the gifts of genius and the royalty of mind. Ella Sheppard was born a slave in the city of Nashville in 1851. Her father, while a slave, had hired his time, and, by economy and toil, had laid up the money to buy his own freedom for $1,800. His wife was owned by a planter in Mississippi, and was carried away from him to that distant State, taking Ella with her. There she was overworked and fell sick, and Ella was near dying of neglect. When the father by accident heard of her condition, he made a journey to Mississippi and bought the child to save its life, and she came with him back to Nashville. He then got together money to buy his wife, but her master refused to sell her, and, as was usual under such circumstances in slavery, he took another wife, who was also a slave, but whose liberty he purchased for $1,300. His family, as now arranged, was, therefore, free; but paying so much money embarrassed him, and, besides, his wife could not get her free papers. Hence she was still a slave, but, as she was the property of her husband,

there was a threat to sell her to pay her husband's debts. To avoid such a calamity he fled to Cincinnati with his wife and child, but with nothing else. Then began new struggles, and when Ella was fifteen years old her father died, and a piano which he had bought for his daughter was sold to pay his debts. But Ella had enjoyed some advantages in Cincinnati, and she found employment as a teacher at six dollars per month, and with this help was studying at the University, when she was chosen to accompany Mr. White.

The gift of song under all these hardships was not concealed; and her history was, in the main, the history of the rest. The whole band, with two or three exceptions, were born in slavery, and when they left Nashville could not find admittance to the most ordinary hotel. At Cincinnati the Commercial announced them as General Fisk's negro minstrels, and they sang in a church and received some encouragement, but their concert failed to pay. And after they left Cincinnati, going northward to Oberlin, and thence to New York, they did not quite meet their expenses, and they often had occasion to repeat with emphasis the words of the slave song:—

> "O, Lord! O, Lord! O, my good Lord!
> Keep me from sinking down!"

At Oberlin they sang with great applause to a convention of Congregational ministers, and received an indorsement which helped them greatly; and Mr. Beecher, in Brooklyn, gave them a hearty welcome and an enthusiastic indorsement, which was borne through the country on the wings of the press; and from that time there was a triumph, and they returned from their New England campaign with $20,000.

The next year their journey through England was a continuous ovation. Just after their arrival in London Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, gave a lunch at his residence to the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal family, and the Jubilee Singers were invited to be present and chant the Lord's Prayer as a grace before meat. They took their position by direction in an alcove, and were quite unnoticed till the sweet and sacred strain fell on the ears of the company, when the attention of all was arrested. Then followed explanations to the advantage of the singers, and they were

asked to sing "John Brown." The Prince of Wales then called for "No more auction block for me," and they were dismissed. Among the guests were the Duke of Sutherland, the Duke and Duchess of Argyle, Earl Granville, Count Munster, Mr. Motley, (then American Minister,) Hon. John Bright, the Bishop of Winchester, (son of the distinguished Wilberforce,) and Mrs. Jenny Lind Goldschmidt, the "Nightingale" of former years, and others less noted. A day or two later a note was received from Mr. Gladstone, in which he said:—

I beg you to accept the assurances of the great pleasure which the Jubilee Singers gave on Monday to our illustrious guests, and to all who heard them. I should wish to offer a little present in books in acknowledgment of their kindness, and in connection with the purposes, as they have announced, of their visit to England. It has occurred to me that, perhaps, they might like to breakfast with us—my family and a few friends—but I would not ask this unless it is thoroughly agreeable to them.

This delicate and characteristic note brought the singers around the table of the Prime Minister of England. Frederick Douglass said on one occasion, while speaking in Dr. Sunderland's church, that it was a long way from the auction-block to the pulpit of a metropolitan church. He might have added, that it was a way which could only be traversed through some divine gift revealed through the instrumentality of culture. It is a long way from the plantation to Mr. Gladstone's table, but it was achieved in this case by the gift of song, developed by education. What stronger proof can we have of educational power?

Rev. Newman Hall, widely known in America, was present as one of the guests at this breakfast, and gave an account of it at the time in the New York Independent. Referring to the American prejudice against the slave color and the insults to which the singers had been subjected on account of it, he said:—

I wish they had been present yesterday, to see Mrs. Gladstone and her daughters, and the noble lords and ladies present, taking their negro friends by the hand, placing them chairs, sitting at their side, pouring out their tea, etc., and conversing with them in a manner utterly free from any approach either to pride or condescension; but exactly as if they had been white people in their own rank in life. And this, not as an effort, nor for the show of it, but from a habit of social intercourse which would have rendered any other conduct impossible.

After the breakfast some time was spent in showing the singers objects of interest among the treasures of art which such a house as Mr. Gladstone's is sure to possess; and when they were all gathered again in the drawing-room, and the guests were about to depart, they were called on to sing, and Mr. Hall's narrative thus continues:—

First, we had "John Brown." I never heard them sing it as they did yesterday. It was not the music alone, but the features of the singers also, which made it so impressive. Their eyes flashed; their countenances told of reverence and joy, and gratitude to God. Never shall I forget Mr. Gladstone's rapt, enthusiastic attention. His form was bent forward, his eyes were riveted, all the intellect and soul of his great nature seemed expressed in his countenance; and when they had finished he kept saying, "Isn't it wonderful! I never heard any thing like it!" The tender thrilling words and music of "O, how I love Jesus!" brought tears to the eyes of the listeners; and when they closed with the Lord's prayer, all the company, led by Mr. Gladstone, reverently stood with bowed heads in worship. Just before leaving the room they sang, "Good-bye, brother; good-bye, sister;" which went to every heart. As brothers and sisters the Premier and Mrs. Gladstone, with their guests, bade them farewell. It was just noon when we passed through the hall, where several persons were waiting on official business to see the Premier, who, doubtless, from that time till late at night was anxiously occupied with public affairs, but whose morning was given up to his negro friends with such heartiness and leisure of mind that a stranger might suppose he was, of all present, the one whose time was most his own.*

*The scene here described recalls a passage in the life of the late William H. Seward. Some time after his election to the Senate, and while he was at his home in Auburn, the rescue of the slave Jerry took place at Syracuse, and a large number of the business men of that city, who were supposed to be engaged in the rescue, were arrested and carried to Auburn, where the United States Court was in session, and arraigned for the offense. They had had no time to employ counsel, or take any measures in reference to the arraignment, and when called to answer were utterly unprepared; but Mr. Seward was in court, and at once offered his services, and it was soon arranged that they should be released on giving bonds for their appearance at a future time. But on looking around the room it was discovered that none of the substantial men of Syracuse were on hand, and on expressing the embarrassment of their position Mr. Seward offered himself as their bail, and he was, of course, accepted, and they were released. He then threw open his house, and invited them to his table to dinner. This took place at the zenith of the abolition excitement, when the name of abolitionist was the most opprobrious epithet that could be pronounced, and, as all the facts were flashed over the United States by telegraph, Mr. Seward was, as he expected to be, the best abused man in the nation. But his generous and noble deportment toward these men, who, in their own view, had committed no crime, was never forgotten either by

We have quoted this passage of history because, as Mr. Jefferson said in the case of Banneker, "it is a document to which the whole color (of the singers) has a right for their justification against the doubts that have been entertained of them." We see from it what development can do for the lowest, and what society loses when it fails to educate the masses of the people. We also see how the negro is to be rescued from public contempt. It is not by any system of forcing, or by virtue of protecting laws or bills of civil rights, however necessary they may be; but by such exhibitions of character, such moral or intellectual qualities, or such displays of genius, as command the public respect. It is not easy to treat with contempt those who "stand before kings." And whenever a gift or endowment is so developed by education as to command the general admiration, it is an inspiration to others, and, therefore, tends to lift up the whole mass.

At the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, the whole population of the United States was not very different in point of numbers from that of the colored population now residing in the Southern States. The country had then been settled for more than 200 years, and there were large interests of production and commerce and government which would seem to demand very liberal provisions for higher institutions of learning. But it may be doubted whether the advantages for education were not inferior to those now possessed by the colored population of the South, after a probation in freedom of scarcely more than a dozen years. The only colleges which appear to have been in existence at that time are in existence still, and can be told by the number of your fingers. They were as follows:—

| Colleges. | When founded. | Graduates. | Average per year. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Harvard | 1638 | 2,567 | 18 |
| William and Mary | 1693 | 496 | 6 |
| Yale | 1701 | 1,405 | 19 |
| New Jersey | 1746 | 567 | 19 |
| Pennsylvania | 1747 | .... | .. |
| Washington and Lee | 1749 | 30 | 1 |
| Columbia | 1754 | 124 | 4 |
| Brown | 1764 | 54 | 5 |
| Dartmouth | 1769 | 43 | 6 |
| Rutgers | 1770 | 13 | 2 |
| Hampden Sidney | 1775 | .... | .. |

the men who were favored or by the men who were maddened. The rescuers were kept under bonds for many years, but never were brought to trial, and Mr. Seward lived to see the fugitive slave law go down in the war which it provoked.

The report of the Commissioner of Education for 1875, from which these figures are derived, also states that the existence of 29 libraries have been traced, containing 3,682 volumes. The library of Fisk University alone is 1,300 volumes, or more than one third of the above sum, and we have seen that there are now in the South, for the benefit of the negro, between 30 and 40 institutions for higher education, with an annual catalogue of nearly 5,000 students; and although they do not, as yet, graduate annually through all the higher departments of learning as many scholars as were graduated from the 10 colleges that were in operation prior to the Revolutionary War, because the training is not for scholarship, but for special work, it seems probable that the educational power is greater and exerts a wider influence.

But whether this is so or not, the result of these brief years of Christian work must be regarded as a phenomenon in the history of the world. It is often said of the movements of our time that they are only history repeating itself; but if there is any thing in history like this generous outpouring of effort and means to redeem a great mass of human merchandise, and lift it up out of its squalor and wretchedness to the level of our common Christian manhood, we exhort the friends of history to produce it.

The new aspect of things in the South under the administration of President Hayes will give a fresh impulse to colored education, and the foundations laid will be even more important than their early promise. At the Georgia constitutional convention last fall there was a very dissatisfied feeling manifested because *foreigners* interested themselves so much about negro education in Georgia, and there was a strong sentiment in favor of taking the matter in hand, and showing that it could be done at home.

During the late visit of the President in the South all the speeches indicated that the feeling in regard to the negro was undergoing a great change. In Atlanta, at the banquet in honor of the President, this change was particularly obvious, and ex-Governor Joseph E. Brown, among other things, said:—

I happen to know that in this city, where we have a public school system, and raise the money for its support by taxation, we have schools for the whites and blacks alike, and the citizens and

wealth of Atlanta are taxed, and have been for years, to educate the colored children, and no complaint is made against it. Not only so, but a college stands over there, (Atlanta University,) and could be seen from this spot but for the intervening buildings, that was originally founded, it is true, by a charitable institution of New England, (American Missionary Association,) but it has been adopted by the State; and, while our Legislature appropriates $8,000 to the State University annually, and has been doing it for many years, it has since 1869 appropriated a like sum of $8,000 annually to this university for colored people, to help build it up. All over Georgia we have a common school system, and we distribute the funds between the children of the races according to numbers. We feel that it is our duty to do justice to them, and, since they are made our fellow-citizens, to make them the best citizens that we can. We pledge you (speaking to the President) that we will do as much for them as you can do, and as much as in your section is done for the lower classes in your society.

If this spirit is generally to prevail in the South we may be assured that it will not be long before all these institutions, planted by Northern Christian benevolence, will be, as Governor Brown expresses it, adopted by the States in which they are located, and perhaps be their pride and glory. But whatever may happen, the history of this movement, both in its generous purposes and its magnificent results, must ever rank among the noblest achievements of modern Christian enterprise.

---

## Art. IV.—THE BLUE LAW FORGERIES OF REV. SAMUEL PETERS.

*The True-Blue Laws of Connecticut and New Haven, and the False Blue-Laws invented by the Rev. Samuel Peters.* To which are added specimens of the Laws and Judicial Proceedings of other Colonies, and some Blue-Laws of England in the reign of James I. Edited by J. Hammond Trumbull. 12mo., pp. 360. Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Company. 1876.

*The Rev. Samuel Peters', LL.D., General History of Connecticut, from its first settlement under George Fenwick, to its latest period of amity with Great Britain prior to the Revolution;* including a description of the country, and many curious and interesting anecdotes. With an Appendix, pointing out the causes of the rebellion in America; together with the particular part taken by the people of Connecticut in its promotion. By a gentleman of the Province. London. 1781. To which are added, additions to appendix, notes, and extracts from letters, verifying many important statements made by the author. By Samuel Jarvis McCormick. 12mo., pp. 285. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1877.

There is a very general impression throughout the country, even among people otherwise well informed, that the early set-

tlers of the colony of New Haven, which was afterward incorporated with the Colony of Connecticut, were characterized by peculiarly narrow views. It is supposed that these views were so narrow that under their influence the colonists were led to a course of legislation in which the element of the ludicrous was conspicuous. In particular, it is believed that there was a law in force, according to which it was made a criminal offense for a woman to kiss her child on Sunday; and that the laws in other respects were so minute in their provisions, so exacting in their requirements, and so severe in their penalties, that they received from the people of the neighboring colonies the name of "Blue Laws."

Now, all this is an entire mistake. Strange as it may seem, the colony which had, perhaps, the least in its legislation of minute interference with the personal concerns of individuals is the one which, in popular estimation, has been made accountable for all the idle stories about the strictness and severity of the Puritans which have been set afloat by their enemies.

In order to place before our readers the means of forming an opinion for themselves on this subject, and to explain the way in which these stories originated, it will be necessary to give some account of the people who settled New Haven, of the objects which they had in view, and of the methods which they took to secure them. It will be seen that such absurd legislation, as it is believed these men attempted, is entirely inconsistent with their character.

It should be understood, then, that the colonists who established themselves in New Haven in 1638 were, for the most part, from the city of London. Their leaders had been engaged there in extensive commercial operations, had discharged important public trusts, and had enjoyed high social position. They were distinguished among all the colonists who came to any part of the country for their superior culture, their wealth, their knowledge of affairs, the largeness of their views, and the greatness of the plans which they proposed to themselves. Not to speak of others of reputation, Governor Eaton had represented his sovereign, Charles I., at the court of Denmark. Governor Hopkins had been successful as a merchant in trade with the countries situated on the Baltic. John Davenport was one of the ablest of the contemporary clergymen of London, who was

never forgotten by his countrymen in his distant home in the wilderness, but continued to be recognized in England, as long as he lived, as one of the most learned and one of the wisest in counsel of all the Puritan clergy on either side of the Atlantic.

These men were the first body of colonists who left England with a definite plan of establishing an independent State on these shores. The views which prevailed at that time in England with regard to the nature and objects of civil government were those which were afterward reduced to system by Sir Robert Filmer. The theory which was accepted was that, by the law of God, all legitimate authority resides in the king; and that there is no other power in the State which can limit him in the exercise of his prerogative: that all his rights, in accordance with the idea of the patriarchal regimen of families, devolve on his death to his heir; each next heir being always king by divine right, and as incapable of being restrained in his sovereignty as of being excluded from it. The doctrine was held—more comprehensive and more monstrous even than that of the Dred Scott decision—which so shocked the moral sense of the American people, *that no subject has any positive rights in behalf of which he may "decline illegal requisitions."* Sir Robert Filmer declared that a subject is "bound to obey the king's command against law, nay, in some cases, against divine laws." Preachers were rewarded and advanced in position for proclaiming that "the king might take the subject's money at his pleasure, and that no one might refuse his demand on penalty of damnation." There could be no lawful resistance to the king. The University of Oxford pronounced a solemn decree that it is in no case lawful for subjects to make use of force against their princes; and all persons promoted to degrees were compelled to subscribe to this article. A little later this same university anathematized as "false, seditious, and impious," the doctrine that civil authority is derived from the people. Furthermore, there could be no release from this thralldom. The subject could not divest himself of the allegiance which he owed to the Lord's anointed. As long as he had life he was amenable to the despotic power of the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission.

Now, the Puritan party in England had begun to oppose

these claims. But even the men who had left England to make new homes beyond the ocean had not disentangled themselves entirely from the old traditions. The constitution which was framed in the cabin of the Mayflower marks a new epoch in the history of constitutional government. Yet those men supposed themselves to be still under English rule. They did not desire to shake it off. They subscribed themselves "the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign, King James," and what they did they declared was done for the "honor of our king and country." The colonists who settled Massachusetts made no progress in theory upon the men of Plymouth. They went out from England under English charters. Their claim to the rights which they asserted was founded in their estimation on the fact that they were free-born Englishmen. The colonists, also, who settled the river towns on the Connecticut did not develop their views till after they had been for some time in this country, and had shared for years the fortunes of the Massachusetts Colony.

It should be remembered, then, that, at a time when these views were every-where accepted, the colony which left England under the leadership of John Davenport and Governor Eaton was formed in London for the express purpose of establishing an independent State on these shores. They claimed that there were rights which were theirs, not because they were Englishmen, but because they were *men*. They fell back on the natural and inherent right which belonged to them by virtue of their manhood. They discarded entirely all allegiance to the Stuarts. They claimed that if they went beyond the limits of any existing English government they were free to expatriate themselves and found a new and independent State. They determined to establish themselves in the American wilderness, without asking for any charter. It was their plan to establish a State, by mutual agreement, beyond the reach of English authority, and without any reference of any kind whatever, express or implied, to the government of the king. They proposed to found a State which should be independent; a State whose professed object should be the "common welfare of all;" a State, moreover, which should be supported and adorned as soon as possible by all those institutions which the wide experience of their leaders in different lands had taught them would give it dignity and

strength, and contribute to the well-being of its citizens. Here, then, is to be found the origin of the peculiar hatred with which the colony of New Haven was regarded from the very first by all the friends of absolute power in Church and State, both in America and in England.

We have said that the chief men among the colonists who settled New Haven had been engaged at home in commercial pursuits. They had been accustomed to conduct enterprises on a large scale with the people of distant countries. It was their plan to build up in America an important commercial city by means of foreign trade. Their enlarged views are seen in the foresight which they manifested in laying out their new town. There was nothing like it on the American continent. Compare the crooked, narrow, hap-hazard lanes, following the cow-paths, and hardly worthy of the name of streets, which still survive in all the older parts of the first towns which were built in other places, with the broad, convenient, and well-ordered streets of New Haven, and it will be seen at once that these men understood what a city is, and how it should be laid out. The commendation now bestowed on the "City of Elms" is no new thing. One of the oldest historians says, that "it outdid the rest of the country in fair and stately houses." Another writer says, "the houses in Boston make a poor show" when compared with those in New Haven. For more than two hundred years similar praises have been heard. Its beauty has, probably, done more to cultivate the taste and give direction in the laying out of all subsequent American towns and cities than any other town in the United States.

The broad views of these founders of New Haven are still further shown by the regard which they paid to education. It was a part of their original plan that provision should be made for universal education. General intelligence was to be the foundation on which their little commonwealth was to rest. One of the first things done by the General Court, at the very time that they were taxing themselves for laying out the town and preparing the means of defense against the savages, was to establish a public school for the instruction of youth; and a committee was appointed to consider "what yearly allowance is meet to be given to it out of the common stock of the town."

And scarcely a twelvemonth had passed from the day of landing when an entry appears in the records of the town, to this effect: "That Thomas Fugill is required to keep Charles Higginson, an indented apprentice, at school one year, or else to advantage him as much in his education as a year's learning comes to." Professor Kingsley says: "Charles Higginson was probably the first apprentice indentured in the colony, and this condition of his apprenticeship was recorded undoubtedly as an example of privileges to be granted to all in the same circumstances. Here is a proceeding which marks, as distinctly as any measure could, the views entertained by the leaders of the colony of the value of education, the protection which ought to be extended to the indigent, and their regard for popular rights. If any one hereafter shall wish to inspect the early colonial records of New Haven to find subjects of reproach or merriment, let him be referred to the entry of the indenture of Charles Higginson. If all the ridiculous and absurd reports which have been circulated about the New Haven laws were founded in fact, this single record, in the opinion of the intelligent and unprejudiced, would throw them at once into the shade. Such a course of policy as is here unfolded, such charity for a class of the community at that time, and still under every European Government, but little regarded, would cover a multitude of sins. No suggestion for the adoption of a rule by which an elementary education was secured to apprentices could have been received from any law of the parent country. No Act of Parliament, it is believed, embracing such a provision, exists in England, with all its improvement and wealth, to the present day."

The views of these men were not limited to securing the advantages of a common-school education to all. It was a part of their original plan, also, to have a Latin school, a college, and a public library. They brought with them a professional classical teacher, Mr. Ezekiel Cheever, whose "Latin Accidence" held its place for more than a century as the accepted text-book in Latin grammar. As early as 1647, the tenth year of the settlement, they began to take definite action with regard to establishing a college, which, in their estimation, was to crown their educational system. Land was then formally set apart for its support. In 1664, the college was actually "set up," but in consequence of the disheartening effect of the

failure of the commercial projects of the colonists, their college never rose above the grade of a Latin school; but it prepared the way for the University which is now known by the name of Yale, which is the direct offspring of the wise plans of the original settlers.

We call attention now to the manner in which the neighboring Indians were treated by the New Haven colony. Dr. Bacon asserts that "New Haven was distinguished among the colonies of the New England confederation for scrupulous justice" towards them. He continues: "How often and how justly has Penn been lauded for the fact that under his administration his colony had no collision with the Indians! and is not the same praise due to the civil and religious leaders of the New Haven colony, for the parallel fact that the relations between New Haven and the wild tribes around were always those of perfect amity?" The Indians of the neighborhood, as all the records show, looked upon their English neighbors as their protectors. When one of them felt himself wronged by the white men he came to the courts here with his complaint as freely as if he were a citizen. The testimony of an Indian was good against a white man. Again and again white men were found guilty and punished on no other testimony. The white man who wronged an Indian was punished the more severely, as his conduct tended to prejudice the heathen against the Gospel and to cause the name of God to be blasphemed among the Gentiles. The Indian who was found guilty of an offense was treated the more gently because of his ignorance, and, being dismissed with such punishment as the rules of righteousness seemed to require in such a case, was told that had he been an Englishman he would not have come off so easily. All the maligners of the Puritans may be defied to show that one rood of ground within their colony was achieved otherwise than by a free, fair bargain, and equitable payment.

The wisdom of these men further appears in the fact, that arriving in New Haven, they were in no haste to make any special code of laws. As might be expected, they found a great deal to do. Although they claimed to be a State, they might very properly be regarded as a large family. They were, in fact, a party of old acquaintances and friends, members of the same Church, who had established themselves in the wilder-

ness. Besides the difficulty of forming a code of laws adapted to their new condition, when they were occupied with so many cares, there was a difficulty of a political nature. They had reason to apprehend that any recognition of the laws of England, however qualified, might lead to the introduction of English supremacy and their own ultimate subjection to the very tyranny from which they had fled. Accordingly, they agreed for the present that they would be "governed by the rules held forth in Scripture;" and magistrates were appointed—men of character, in whose wisdom they had confidence—who were empowered to render judgment in all cases which should come before them in accordance with these "rules held forth in Scripture" and the dictates of reason. There is danger that in this nineteenth century we may forget what a great step in advance the New Haven colonists made when they incorporated this idea into the constitution of their young republic. At home the extreme doctrine, as we have already said, was openly avowed, and applauded by the Court, "that if princes commanded any thing which subjects might not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without resisting, or railing, or reviling, and so to yield a passive obedience when they cannot yield an active one." In opposition to all such views, the purpose of these men was to found a Christian State, where the object should be not to satisfy the whims of a king, but "to secure the common welfare of all," as they expressed it; and where their "common welfare" was to be sought by making the word of God as it is found in the Bible the foundation of all legislation. Or, as Dr. Bacon has said, "Christianity—the ethics of Christianity—was to be the constitution of the commonwealth, the supreme law of the land."

Five years passed away, and the system was found to work well. The planters were still too much occupied to draw up a formal code adapted to their new wants, and it was, therefore, ordered by the General Court, in 1644, "that the judicial laws of God as they were delivered by Moses, and as they are a fence to the moral law, *being neither typical nor ceremonial, nor having any reference to Canaan*, shall be a rule to all the courts in this jurisdiction in their proceedings against offenders *till they be branched out into particulars hereafter*." The de-

cision of the duly appointed magistrates, and all the proceedings of the courts from the first, were recorded in full at the time, and have been accurately printed and are everywhere easily accessible; and for their general conformity with the "dictates of wisdom" have won the applause of the ablest jurists and the most profound students of our early history. In illustration of the wisdom of the course of their early legislation, Dr. Bacon, in his "Historical Discourses," says:—

Remember now that, situated as they were, they must adopt either the laws of England or some other known system—a system entirely new they could not frame immediately. Should they, then, adopt the laws of England as the laws of their young Republic? Those were the very laws from which they had fled. Those laws would subject them at once to the king, to the Parliament, and to the prelates in their several jurisdictions. The adoption of the laws of England would have been fatal to the object of their emigration. Should they then adopt the Roman civil law, which is the basis of the jurisprudence of most countries in Europe? That system is foreign to the genius of Englishmen, and to the spirit of freedom, and, besides, was unknown to the body of the people for whom laws were to be provided. What other course remained to them, if they wished to separate themselves from the power of the enemies who had driven them into banishment, and to provide for a complete and vital independence, but to adopt at once a system of laws which was in every man's hand, which every man read, and, as he was able, expounded in his family, and with which every subject of the jurisdiction could easily be made familiarly acquainted?

And what was there of absurdity in this code, considered as a code for just such a settlement as this was? Where are we, that we need to raise such a question? Is it in a Christian country that the question must be argued, whether the Mosaic law, excluding whatever is typical, or ceremonial, or local, is absurd, as the basis or beginning of a system of jurisprudence? Suppose the planters of Quinnipiack had taken as their rule, in the administration of justice, the laws of Solon, or Lycurgus, or the laws of the twelve tables: suppose the agreement had been, that the laws of King Alfred should be followed in the punishment of offenders, in the settlement of controversies between individuals, and in the division of estates—where had been the absurdity? Who will tell us that the laws of Moses are less wise or equitable than the laws of any other of the legislators of antiquity?

The laws of Moses were given to a community emigrating from their native country, into a land which they were to acquire and occupy for the great purpose of maintaining in simplicity and purity the worship of the one true God. The founders of this colony came hither for the self-same purpose. Their emigration from

their native country was a religious emigration. Every other interest of their community was held subordinate to the purity of their religious faith and practice. So far, then, as this point of comparison is concerned, the laws which were given to Israel in the wilderness may have been suited to the wants of a religious colony planting itself in America.

The laws of Moses were given to a people who were to live not only surrounded by heathen tribes on every frontier save the seaboard, but also with heathen inhabitants, worshipers of the devil, intermixed among them, not fellow-citizens, but men of another and barbarous race; and the laws were, therefore, framed with a special reference to the corrupting influence of such neighborhood and intercourse. Similar to this was the condition of our fathers. The Canaanite was in the land, with his barbarian vices, with his heathenish and hideous superstitions; and their servants and children were to be guarded against the contamination of intercourse with beings so degraded.

The laws of the Hebrews were designed for a free people. Under those laws, so unlike all the institutions of Oriental despotism, there was no absolute power, and, with the exception of the hereditary priesthood, whose privileges as a class were well balanced by their labors and disabilities, no privileged classes. The aim of those laws was "equal and exact justice;" and equal and exact justice is the only freedom. Equal and exact justice in the laws, and in the administration of the laws, infuses freedom into the being of a people, secures the widest and most useful distribution of the means of enjoyment, and affords scope for the activity, and healthful stimulus to the affections of every individual. The people whose habits and sentiments are formed under such an administration of justice will be a free people.

But it is worth our while to notice two of the most important effects of their renouncing the laws of England, and adopting the Mosaic law. In the first place, the principle on which inheritances were to be divided was materially changed. In England the usage prevailed of giving all real estate to the eldest son. This is the pillar of the English aristocracy. Let this one principle be taken away; let estates, instead of passing undivided to a single heir, be divided among many heirs, and that vast accummulation of wealth in the hands of a few great families is at an end. But the Jewish law divides inheritances among all the children, giving to the eldest son, as the head of the family, only a double portion. This promotes equality among the people, breaking up the rich man's great estate into as many portions as he has children, and thus insuring the constant division and general distribution of property. How different is the aspect of this country now from what it would have been, if the feudal law of inheritance had been from the beginning the law of the land! How incalculable has been the effect on the character of the people!

Notice, in the next place, how great a change, in respect to the inflicting of capital punishments, was made by adopting the He-

brew laws, instead of the laws of England. By the laws of England more than one hundred and fifty crimes were, till quite lately, punishable with death. By the laws which the New England colonists adopted, this bloody catalogue was reduced to eleven. On such a difference as this it would be idle to expatiate. In determining what kind of men our fathers were, we are to compare their laws, not with ours, but with the laws which they renounced. The greatest and boldest improvement which has been made in criminal jurisprudence, by any one act, since the dark ages, was that which was made by our fathers, when they determined, "that the judicial laws of God, as they were delivered by Moses, and as they are a fence to the moral law, being neither typical, nor ceremonial, nor having any reference to Canaan, shall be accounted of moral equity, and generally bind all offenders, and be a rule to all the courts." Whatever improvements in this respect we have made since their day may be resolved into this: We have learned to distinguish better than they between that in the laws of Moses which was of absolute obligation, being founded on permanent and universal reasons only, and that which was ordained in reference to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew nation, and which was therefore temporary or local.

What manner of men these colonists were appears, also, from the fact that in eighteen successive annual elections they chose such a man as Theophilus Eaton to be their chief magistrate. Dr. Bacon says, as the result of his study of the services of Governor Eaton: "I have acquired new views of the dignity which belongs to the place of the civil magistrate." Hubbard, the historian of Massachusetts, who was one of his contemporaries, says:—

> This man had in him great gifts, and as many excellences as are usually found in any one man. He had an excellent princely face and port, commanding respect from all others. He was a good scholar, a traveler, a great reader; of an exceeding steady and even spirit, not easily moved to passion, and standing unshaken in his principles when once fixed upon; of a profound judgment, full of majesty and authority in his judicatures, so that it was a vain thing to offer to brave him out; and yet, in his ordinary conversation, and among friends, of such pleasantness of behavior, and such felicity and fecundity of harmless wit, as can hardly be paralleled.

Mather describes him as he appeared at home: "In the government of his family he was prudent, serious, happy to a wonder; and albeit he sometimes had a large family, consisting of no less than thirty persons, yet he managed them with such an even temper that observers have affirmed they never saw a

house ordered with more wisdom." "He kept," we are told, an honorable and hospitable table." It may not be out of place to mention, in this connection, that in the inventory of his estate after his death we find mentioned "plate" to an amount considerably above one hundred pounds sterling, without taking into the account other articles in silver, of the value of forty pounds sterling, which Mrs. Eaton claimed "as her proper estate." His "wearing apparel," not including jewelry, which is set down by itself, is inventoried at fifty pounds sterling. There is mention made of "the green chamber," with a "cypress chest," the "blue chamber," and various other rooms and "chambers," with abundant furnishing; the "hall," with its drawing table, round table, green cushions, great chair with needle-work, high chairs and high stools, low chairs and low stools, Turkey carpet, high-wine stools, great brass andirons, together with books, and a globe, and a map, which last are inventoried at about fifty pounds, all which show, in the words of an old historian, that, notwithstanding the failure of his commercial plans, the governor maintained a port in some measure answerable to his place. Yet, we are told, "he countenanced the addresses to himself of the children and servants with any of their inquiries." One of his servants could say many years after his master's death: "Whatever difficulty in my daily walk I now meet withal, still something that I either saw or heard in my blessed master Eaton's conversation helped me through it all." Now, an intelligent and independent community who could appreciate for so long a period the virtues of such a chief magistrate, were, without doubt, themselves possessed in no small degree of the same virtues. This exhibition of mutual confidence is creditable to both.

This, then, has been our object thus far, to show that the character of the colonists who settled New Haven, and especially the character of their distinguished leaders, was such that it is impossible that there could have been any such ridiculous legislation, as it is believed they were responsible for. We have already said that the records of the courts, and of all the public proceedings of the colony, remain in perfect preservation to this day, and that they have been published, and are easily accessible. We do not claim that there was no legislation which, in the light of the nineteenth century, does not seem

unwise. The colonists were Englishmen of the seventeenth century, and were still swayed in many things by the traditions of their age and of their country. But we do claim that they were distinguished from all the other colonists by the fact that they avoided many of their serious errors, and especially that in their legislation they were free from what their calumniators have been disposed to characterize as "the ludicrous."

But our work will not be done till we give an explanation of the way in which this libel about the "Blue Laws" originated. This explanation the writer of this article suggested some years ago, and it has been accepted by some of the best students of the history of those times.

But, in order to understand it, it will be necessary to pass to a period nearly a hundred years distant from the settlement of New Haven, to a time when it had become incorporated with the Colony of Connecticut. The colony, too, which had been established at the mouth of the Hudson River, under the auspices of the Dutch West India Company, had come under the control of the English crown. The state of things which ensued has been so well described by Dr. Bacon that we transfer a brief quotation to our pages:—

> Already the Church of England was virtually the established Church in that province. . . . It was also well understood that to bring the New England colonies into an ecclesiastical conformity with England would greatly promote their loyalty, and the permanence of their dependence on the crown. The royal governors of New York were, therefore, doing whatever in their power they could do to show that the English conquest of that province from the Dutch had brought in the Church of England; and that English ascendency was the ascendency of the English Prayer Book and the English hierarchy, no less than of the English language. . . . From the moment that New Amsterdam became New York, the royal power, with the pomp and prestige attendant on a royal government, was nearer to Connecticut than it had ever been before. The almost independent self-government instituted by the founders of the colony, and confirmed by a charter from King Charles II., had become precarious. Its dissolution, and the reduction of the people into an immediate and entire dependence on the crown, were confidently expected by all malcontents, and eagerly helped on by those who thought that under royal governors like Andros and Cornbury the chances for them would be better than under the self-government of a Puritan people.

The "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" was meanwhile established in England to help on this important work. Under its direction missionaries of the Church of England entered New England at the nearest point, which was, of course, Connecticut; and a few congregations were gathered by them in different places in the colony.

It is very natural that, under these circumstances, mutual jealousies should spring up. The people of Connecticut, who had been for two or three generations on the soil, were simple in their manners, strongly attached to the faith of their fathers, and proud of the liberties which they enjoyed under their charter. The English emigrants who had been attracted to the newly-acquired province of New York were generally in hearty sympathy in their religious views with the most extreme claims of the High-Church party, and in politics were Tories. When they left home, the Puritan party, which had done so much for the liberties of England, was in disgrace. Its principles were flouted at. All manner of ridicule was heaped upon every thing and every body belonging to it. Even if these emigrants had any of them been moderate in their views at home, the tendency, when once in New York under the rule of a royal governor, was to magnify more and more all the institutions of their native land, and especially the power and the dignity of the king, from whom was to come all favor and advancement; and in the same way to despise those sturdy republican neighbors with whom they were not unfrequently brought into collision, and whom they found so contented with their independence and their self-government.

Now, it is to be remembered that in those days, when all traveling was attended with every kind of difficulty, New Haven—which was the nearest town of importance, and the one with which they had most to do—was to them practically "New England." It was the part of New England about which they knew the most, and that part of it which they pictured to themselves whenever "New England" was spoken of.

So it came about that all the stories, true or false, which in any way redounded to the discredit of the descendants of the Puritans anywhere throughout all New England, were at once, in the common apprehension of the people of New York

and of all those in other places who possessed the same sympathies, attached to New Haven; and this colony was made to bear the burden. And when these advocates of arbitrary and hereditary rights learned, as they soon did, the early history of New Haven; and found that—in accordance with the principles afterward avowed in the "Declaration" of 1776—an independent government had once been set up here by voluntary compact; and that those who did it had done so with the belief that their own elected magistrates had "as perfect an authority to exercise all the functions of government as any potentate on earth," they were astounded at the "bigotry" and the "fanaticism" displayed! "The doctrine that the majesty of a State, with laws and powers ordained of God, could spring into being by the lifting up of the hands of a few exiles under the rafters of a barn, with no sanction of papal bull or royal charter," inspired them with bitter and relentless hatred. Henceforth they could believe any stories about this Puritan city, however absurd!

Massachusetts and Plymouth were too far removed from their range of vision for any thing about either of them, even though it were true, to remain long in their memories connected with those particular colonies. If they heard of the enactment in a former age of sumptuary laws in those distant regions, or laws with regard to tobacco, or laws in regulation of the dress of females, they soon forgot the locality, and fell into the habit of laying them to the charge of New Haven, where it is to be always remembered *there was never any thing of the kind!* New Haven was situated on the frontier, and had to take the brunt of every thing.

But the spirit of independence was rapidly spreading. Mr. Bancroft tells us that after a time even the "bigoted royalists of New York began to vie with New England" in their efforts for "a liberal constitution." The opening days of the Revolution dawned, and now was seen at last the triumph of those principles so long misunderstood, and so long derided, to establish which John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton left their homes and braved all the terrors of the wilderness in 1638.

But there were royalists in the different colonies, as is well known, who could have no sympathy with what they felt to be

the frenzy which had impelled the American people to cast off their allegiance to Great Britain. Among them were some of the most respected persons in the country, for whose conscientious convictions we feel all proper respect. There were others whose conduct in that crisis has justly excited universal contempt. Among the number of those included in the last class is Rev. Samuel Peters, who, at the commencement of the Revolutionary War was an Episcopal missionary in Hebron, Connecticut. As he was very active in asserting the royal claims, he became obnoxious to the patriots of the day, and was threatened by a mob, though it is believed no serious personal violence was done him. About 1774 he went to England, highly exasperated against his country, and especially against his native State. He employed himself, while the war continued, in reviling the colonists in the papers of the time, and in 1781 published in London, without his name, a "History of Connecticut." In this "History," were collected all the extravagant stories that had been set afloat during the previous fifty years to gratify the stupidity of those among the lower classes in New York who were descended from the Dutch, or the hatred of the most bitter of the British royalists. This "History" it is which is the "authority" for the "Blue Laws," which were attributed to the New Haven colonists.

Some of these laws are as follows:—

No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting-day.

No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath-day.

No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in the garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

Whoever wears cloaths, trimmed with gold, silver, or bone lace, above two shillings by the yard, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the selectmen shall tax the offender £300 estate.

No one shall read Common Prayer, keep Christmas or Saints' days, make mince pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, trumpet, and jews'-harp.

Every male shall have his hair cut round, according to a cap.

According to Mr. Peters, these laws were by no means confined to New Haven. His explicit statement is, that "similar laws still prevail over New England as the common law of the country!" (*That is, less than a hundred years ago, in* 1781.)

Professor Kingsley says, ("Historical Discourse," page 84:)

When this work first appeared, its extravagances and falsehoods were so apparent and gross, that any attempt to contradict or expose them was considered unnecessary and superfluous. The work was evidently designed chiefly, to render the people of Connecticut odious and despicable abroad; but its abuse was so outrageous, and its statements so opposed to the most notorious facts, that even with respect to foreigners, it was thought to need no refutation. There were, however, in Connecticut, at the time this pretended History appeared, individuals who sympathized strongly with its author. They had cherished the same antipathies and resentments as Peters himself; and as the English interest declined in the United States, they were glad to seize even upon such support as this miserable farrago afforded them. Its stories were to their taste; and they repeated them so often as apparently to create in themselves a sort of belief in the truth of some of them. The credit, however, acquired by this work was never extensive; and its real character has been generally too well understood to call for direct animadversion. Dr. Trumbull once told me, in reply to the question, why, in his "History of Connecticut," he had made no allusion to this work of Dr. Peters—that he had considered a reference to it as wholly unnecessary; since any one, on very slight examination, would see that it was refuted in so many of its statements by indubitable public documents, that it could gain no credit. He said that he had been well acquainted with Dr. Peters from very early life (I think he stated that they were both natives of Hebron), that they were contemporary in college (Dr. Peters graduated at Yale College in 1757, Dr. Trumbull in 1759), and that an occasional intercourse between them had been maintained till Dr. Peters went to England in 1774. He added, that of all men with whom he had ever been acquainted, Dr. Peters, he had thought, from his first knowledge of him, the least to be depended upon as to any matter of fact; especially "in story-telling."

According to Mr. Peters, the epithet "blue" was applied to the laws of New Haven because they were thought to be peculiarly sanguinary; and he says "blue" is here equivalent to "bloody." He says: "They were all sanctified with excommunication, confiscation, fines, banishment, whippings, cutting off the ears, burning the tongue, and death." In answer to all this, it is enough to refer to what has already been stated in this article, that while, according to the laws of England, one hundred and fifty crimes were punishable with death, the catalogue was reduced at once in New Haven to fourteen or fifteen.

As we have said, the only authority for the "blue laws" is this Mr. Peters. We do not propose to spend many words upon him. He was a man who was utterly incapable of tell-

ing the truth on any subject. His so-called "History" was the malicious libel of a Tory refugee in England, at a time of war, who was receiving a pension from the ministry, and was hoping to gain further favor by vilifying his native State. When it was published, it was said at once in London that it bore "so many marks of party spleen and idle credulity that it was altogether unworthy of the public attention." Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, formerly Secretary of State of Connecticut, than whom no one is better acquainted with the history of Connecticut, says there are not six consecutive sentences in the book which are not open to criticism. It is filled with stories which would not be out of place in the Travels of the Baron Munchausen. We have space only to refer, simply as specimens, to Mr. Peters' description of an army of caterpillars who "came in one night" and "covered the earth, on both sides of the Connecticut river, to an extent of three miles in length and two in depth;" to his story about the "Windham frogs," who filled a road forty rods wide and four miles in length; to his account of the falls of the Connecticut river, which are known as Bellows' Falls, where the water is set back, and spreads over the meadows twenty-four miles wide, and is at the same time so deep that ships of war may sail there; to his description of the "Indian paw-waw" at Stratford, where devils were seen to seize several persons and "to mount with them into the air;" to his statement that the Rev. George Whitefield, in 1740, attempted to "bring down" the walls of the fort at Saybrook by prayer, while he walked seven times around them, in imitation of Joshua at Jericho, to the sound of rams' horns; to his claim that Yale College was founded by one of his ancestors; to his story of the Grigson will case in New Haven. His exaggerations even of things with which he must have been perfectly familiar are amazing! The malice with which he wrote is especially apparent in his statement that the Rev. Thomas Hooker, of Hartford, one of the saints of his time, in order to get possession of the lands of an Indian king by the name of Connecticote, who, it may be mentioned in passing, is an altogether mythical character, communicated the small-pox to him by means of a Bible which he presented to him, the leaves of which were poisoned with the virus. Any one who now offers the statements of Mr. Peters to prove any thing

whatever makes himself ridiculous. But it was not only in his "History" that his falsehoods abound. In the periodicals of the day he lied about his ancestors, he lied about his wife, he lied about himself. Every time public attention is turned to him some new falsehood of his comes to light. Quite recently it has been almost, if not quite, proved that he lied about the degree of Doctor of Laws which he claimed to have received from an institution in Cortona in Tuscany! And yet this collection of absurd falsehoods, called a "History," has been taken up by the enemies of the Puritans because it furnishes them with convenient weapons of ridicule, and has served to obscure the reputation of some of the best and the noblest men who have ever lived on the American continent.

It is to be remembered that what a nation has most to be proud of is not its material wealth, the length of its rivers, the fertility of its soil, the treasures in its mines; it is the men who have best advanced its interests, and left the example of an honorable life to those who come after them. The political or ecclesiastical partisan, then, who deliberately seeks to depreciate and vilify the characters of those who have rendered important services to their country, robs the nation of its richest treasure, and deserves to be ever remembered with scorn.

There still remains that we should say a few words about the books whose titles we have placed at the head of this paper.

Hon. J. Hammond Trumbull, one of the best informed and most careful historical students in the country, has brought together in the first, within the compass of some three hundred duodecimo pages, all the material which will enable any one in a few moments to form an independent opinion with regard to the authenticity of the code of laws which Mr. Peters has given in his book, and which he has stigmatized as "blue, i. e., bloody laws." Mr. Trumbull begins with a republication of the "Connecticut Constitution of 1638–39;" or "the fundamental orders by which the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield became associated and conjoined to be as one Public State or Commonwealth—not a confederacy of petty sovereignties, but a union under a government of the people's choice, exercising the supreme power of

the Commonwealth, and maintaining liberty under law." As Mr. Trumbull says: "This constitution has been justly characterized as the first properly American Constitution—a work in which the framers were permitted to give body and shape for the first time to the genuine republican idea that dwelt as an actuating force or inmost sense in all the New England colonies." That the spirit which actuated these people may be better understood, Mr. Trumbull adds a sketch of the sermon which the Rev. Thomas Hooker preached before the General Court in May, 1638, when the Constitution was framed. He adds, also, an extract from his letter to Gov. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, giving his views respecting the nature of civil government, and stating his conviction that "a general council chosen by all to transact businesses which concern all is most safe for the relief of the whole." Then follow the twelve capital laws established in 1642. After this is placed the first Connecticut Code, which was compiled by Roger Ludlow; then such laws and orders of the Connecticut courts (1636–1662) as were repealed before the adoption of the code of 1650, and such as were made between 1650 and the re-establishment under the charter in 1662, together with a few judgments rendered and sentences pronounced by the General and Particular Courts. Next, the "Fundamental Agreement of the Planters of New Haven," which is the constitution of the New Haven Colony, and which was adopted by the free planters June 14, 1639, and which continued in force until the union of the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut in 1665. Then appears the New Haven code of laws of 1655; to which are added specimens of the judgments of the New Haven General Court before 1655. Mr. Trumbull then gives in full the "Blue Law Forgeries of Peters," and finally selections from the contemporary laws and judicial proceedings of other colonies, namely: New York, Virginia, Maryland, and Massachusetts, together with some of the laws of England in the reign of James I.

No better method could be adopted to show the baselessness of the popular idea that the legislation of Connecticut and New Haven was characterized by any special severity, or that there was in it any thing absurd or ridiculous. It is thus made to stand out amid the legislation of the times as eminently wise

and dignified. It hardly need be said that such has been the opinion of all unprejudiced historical students. Mr. Bancroft says: "There is no State in the Union, and I know not any in the world, in whose early history, if I were a citizen, I could find more of which to be proud, and less that I should wish to blot." Dr. Horace Bushnell says: "Its early history is the most beautiful that was ever permitted to any State or people in the world."

In a valuable "Introduction" of forty-two pages Mr. Trumbull reminds his readers that in determining what kind of men the fathers of New Haven and Connecticut were, their legislation must be compared, not with ours at the present time, but with the contemporary legislation of the other colonies and of the parent country. Estimated in this way, it at once appears what advance was made in the legislation of New Haven and Connecticut, and it is shown that much of the severe and ridiculous legislation which has been falsely charged on New Haven and Connecticut was actually true of New York and Virginia, and other colonies to the south and west.

The author of the second book whose title we have placed at the head of this paper is a descendant of the Rev. Thomas Peters, and professes to give a republication of the "History of Connecticut" from the original copy which belonged to his ancestor, as it left his hands. He says, however, that he has "used notes and quotations from writers and authors of high repute, and from documents and manuscripts written before the Revolutionary War." Now, such a republication would, doubtless, have a value. The original edition has been long a rare book, as is even the American reprint of 1829. But—would it be believed?—Mr. McCormick has actually interwoven his new matter with the old in such a way that it is impossible to tell which is the work of Mr. Peters and which of Mr. McCormick! Occasionally there is a note marked as editorial, which would naturally lead the reader to suppose that the other notes, which are not thus accredited, are a part of the original publication of his ancestor. This is not all. Mr. McCormick has even taken liberties with the text, and seems to have suppressed at will important passages. Then, too, his failure to correct some amusing and glaring typographical errors in the original, together with certain other errors as glaring into

which he falls himself, reveal his own ignorance and his utter incompetence for the work he has attempted. The republication, in its way, makes a very suitable companion volume for the original "History." Both are worthless, except for the book collector.

---

## Art. V.—WAS WESLEY ORDAINED A BISHOP BY ERASMUS?

A LETTER written in the beginning of this century by a clergyman of the Episcopal Church to a brother clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church has called forth this present article. Its preparation is due to the belief that a free, full, and impartial investigation of the alleged ordination of Wesley by the Greek bishop, Erasmus, to the episcopacy, is not to be found in the range of Methodist literature. Why it has been almost banished from the writings of our excellent historians and casuists in Church polity I will not presume to show, being persuaded that their works will bear the test of severest criticism as to candor, prudence, and honor. It may be that the letter, soon to be given, will supply the reason for silence at a time when to speak would have been unwise. Whatever reasons may heretofore have had a constraining influence, nothing now restrains a laudable endeavor to "set up the ancient landmarks" by which the line of Methodist ordinations may be traced to its source.

I propose to carry the subject through the following categories: 1. What proof have we of Mr. Wesley's consecration by Erasmus? 2. What may be found to disprove such a statement? 3. Would the admission of the Erasmian consecration be the best interpretation of Mr. Wesley's ecclesiastical actions?

1. Was Mr. John Wesley ordained bishop by Erasmus?

In addition to the current literature, the following letter will be read with unaffected interest:—

CORLEAR'S HOOK, NEW YORK, *May* 11, 1809.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: I was highly entertained yesterday at the Conference in John-street, at which presided the Right Rev. Francis Asbury, Bishop over the Methodist Churches in America, whose episcopal authority has been spoken against by some of the

Episcopalians claiming authority under the Latin Church, who boldly deny the validity of Methodist episcopacy, and found their assertions on a point by no means certain—that the Rev. John Wesley was never more than a presbyter in the Church of England, and, of course, could not consecrate Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and others, to a higher order than a presbyter.

I took it for granted that the said denial was made with a view to expose the Methodist Bishops to the severity of the *Præmunire* Act of Henry VIII., if the Methodists should prove that the Rev. John Wesley was consecrated a Bishop in the Christian Church by Erasmus, a Greek Bishop, and now Bishop and successor of Titus, first Bishop of Crete. But if the Methodists do not come forward and prove Mr. Wesley to be a Bishop according to the Greek Church, then the enemy will say the Methodist episcopacy is but a Latin presbytery.

Seeing a book entitled, "An Enquiry into the Validity of Methodist Episcopacy," and considering its artful tendency, I published a vindication of the history of the Rev. Hugh Peters, and added a note which gives the origin of Methodist episcopacy in England. My design was to warn the Methodists to keep out of the reach of the English *Præmunire* Act, and to let their enemies vaunt over their own bold assertions rather than expose to certain misery and death their pious and conscientious bishops, who would sooner run their heads against a burning mountain than usurp episcopacy.

Had I been present when Erasmus consecrated Mr. John Wesley a Bishop in the Christian Church, I would sooner broil on the gridiron with St. Lawrence than divulge it and prove it, so long as the English *Præmunire* Act exists as a pillar to support the hierarchy of the Church of England.

Dr. Seabury I introduced to Mr. John Wesley after the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to consecrate him Bishop of Connecticut, and Mr. Wesley would have consecrated him, and Dr. Seabury was willing to be consecrated by Mr. Wesley; but Mr. Wesley, by the best advice, would not sign the letter of orders to Seabury as Bishop in the Christian Church.

Then Dr. Horn, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Barkley, and others, advised Dr. Seabury to receive his consecration from the Jacobite Bishops in Scotland, who are not State Bishops, but were degraded from being Lord Bishops because they would not take the oath of allegiance to William III. in 1688.

I pretend not to be in the secret of the consecration of Mr. John Wesley by Erasmus, but I am so convinced of the fact that I would as soon be consecrated a Bishop in the Christian Church by Bishop Asbury, or ——, Bishop Coke, or ——, as by Dr. Sutton, Archbishop of Canterbury, or by Dr. Porteus, Lord Bishop of London. And that the *jure divino* of episcopacy from Erasmus came from St. John of Jerusalem Rome and England admit; but Rome admits not the *jure divino* episcopacy in the Church of England.

The question still remains, Was Mr. John Wesley made a

bishop by Erasmus, now Bishop of Crete? The answer is valid —John Wesley would not have acted as bishop if he had not been consecrated by Erasmus, nor would Dr. Coke, nor Mr. Asbury, etc. Thus believed Dr. Horn, Dr. Barkley, Charles Wesley, and hundreds of others who knew them, as well as, Rev. and dear brother, Yours affectionately, SAMUEL A. PETERS.*

I am Bishop elect of Ver(d)mont; should I ever go there or in Connecticut, I would solicit a consecration by a bishop in the line from Erasmus, in order to be free of error supposed to exist in the Latin Church.

The Rev. Mr. COATES, Pearl-street, New York.

Who was Samuel A. Peters? A minister of the Church of England; a man, it is said, "of talents, learning, and extensive erudition." After having "a parochial charge in London for thirty years," he emigrated to these United States, and was Bishop elect of Vermont, mention of which fact may be found in the journals of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, where, also, it is asserted that his consecration was refused on the ground that the Convention of Vermont had not signed the Constitution of the above-mentioned Church. He was personally known to the early Methodist preachers, one of whom has left the following interesting statement of a conversation with him:—

Dr. Peters informed me that when Dr. Seabury was refused consecration by the Bishop in England, the said Bishop told him he was prohibited by the law of the realm from consecrating him, but advised him to apply to Mr. Wesley for consecration. Dr. Seabury replied, "Is Wesley a bishop?" To which the Bishop answered, "We do not undertake to answer that question. It is not for us to determine. But apply to him; he can satisfy you, and consecrate you." Dr. Peters was present at the interview, and went with and introduced Dr. Seabury to Mr. Wesley, who was

* The above letter was written to Rev. Samuel Coate, who was at that time Presiding Elder of Lower Canada District. A copy of it was furnished to Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, among whose controversial MSS. it was found. Mr. Cooper collected a large body of notes, with a view of publishing a book on the origin of Methodist episcopacy. The letter is marked No. VII in the list of papers he had arranged for publication. Mr. Cooper was himself well acquainted with Dr. Peters, and thus speaks of him: "Dr. Samuel A. Peters is an Episcopal minister of the Church of England—of talents, learning, and extensive erudition; was minister in parochial charge thirty years in London. He was Bishop elect for Vermont, (see the Journals of the General Convention, where it is mentioned,) and no reason was offered for refusing his consecration but that the Convention of Vermont had not signed their Constitution." These highly valuable MSS. were kindly put into my hands by Mr. Cooper's nephew, Rev. I. T. Cooper, D.D., of Camden, Del.

so far satisfied that he would have been willingly consecrated by him if Mr. Wesley would have signed his letter of orders as Bishop, which Mr. Wesley could not do without incurring the penalty of the *Præmunire* Act. He would have signed as Superintendent, etc.

Dr. Peters also gave the following: "A clergyman once asked Mr. Wesley, 'Were you consecrated bishop by Erasmus?' Wesley replied, 'Have you read the *Præmunire* Act?' 'Yes.' 'Would you have me answer you truly?' 'Yes, or not at all.' 'Then, under the circumstances, I cannot answer you.'"

The point in the letter with which we are almost exclusively concerned is the consecration of Wesley by Erasmus. If the testimony of credible witnesses to the alleged act of consecration was available the question could be easily solved, but Dr. Peters does not pretend "to be in the secret of Mr. Wesley's consecration," nor have we ever heard of any one who does. It may be that some traveler whose attention is drawn to the subject may discover in the Arcadian archives, among the documents of Erasmus, the necessary information to make the affirmative of the question positive. We commend the search to those who have leisure and inclination to make it.

Again, few will contend—we certainly should deny—that Mr. Wesley has ever stated publicly that he performed any act of an episcopal character by virtue of any authority supposed to be derived from the Erasmian consecration. His enemies called him the Bishop of Moorfields, but he styled himself a presbyter of the Church of England. On the other hand, it must be admitted by all that, though asked, both in public and in private, about the alleged consecration, neither he nor his friends who knew him best have ever denied that he was so consecrated. And if he was, it was an act which he might obviously desire should be kept secret. He knew how great would be the peril to him and his societies on account of the malignity of his enemies; nor could he hope to escape from a persecution far more to be dreaded than that which was visited upon him for the consent he gave to ordinations by Erasmus, about which there has been no dispute. And, finally, though no public announcement of such an act has been made, and no record is traceable in all his writings, yet the allegation will be

materially supported if upon investigation it be found that his acts, subsequently to his asserted ordination, will admit of a more intelligent and fairer explanation on that supposition than any other hypothesis will give them.

Let us now proceed to particulars.

Erasmus, a Bishop in the Greek Church, of the diocese of Arcadia, in Crete, visited London in 1763. During his sojourn in that city he became acquainted with Mr. Wesley and some of his preachers. He was impressed by the magnitude and success of the wonderful revival then in progress, and likewise was aware of the grave embarrassments that pressed upon Mr. Wesley because of the urgent entreaties of the larger societies, especially, to have the sacraments administered to them in their own chapels. He found John Wesley to be almost alone in the grave responsibility of caring for the thousands who had been awakened to a religious life. Of ministerial helpers he had but few. His brother Charles had ceased to itinerate in 1757. There was danger lest the Methodist preachers should undertake to administer the Lord's supper without previous ordination. Some had already done so. Mr. Wesley believed it to be a sin for an unordained minister to celebrate the eucharist; but he was unwilling to violate the established order by himself ordaining any of his preachers. Pressed by these conditions, he applied to the Greek bishop to ordain John Jones, one of his helpers, having first sought and obtained satisfactory evidence of the episcopal character of that prelate. Mr. Jones was ordained, as were also others who were recommended; but the storm of opposition beat so ruthlessly upon his head that, though he had put on the gown, he was soon forced to leave the connection.

In the following year a writer in "Lloyd's Evening Post" boldly asserted that (in addition to the ordinations made by Erasmus, in which number may be included Alexander Mather, subsequently ordained by Mr. Wesley to be his successor over the Methodist societies in England) "two celebrated Methodist preachers made also application to the same Bishop, to consecrate one or both of them bishops; but that the Greek told them it was contrary to the rules of his Church for one bishop to make another; yet, notwithstanding all he said, they very unwillingly took a denial."

Seven years later Rev. Augustus Toplady, among other categories propounded to Mr. Wesley, reiterated the charge above mentioned by the inquiry, "*Did you not strongly press this supposed Greek Bishop to consecrate you a bishop, that you might be invested with a power of ordaining what ministers you pleased to officiate in your societies as clergymen?*" (The italics are ours.) "In all this did you not palpably violate the oath of supremacy which you have repeatedly taken—part of which runs thus: 'I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm?'"

How did Mr. Wesley meet this implied charge? According to one of his biographers, Rev. Richard Watson, "he was falsely reported to have sought consecration."* Another, Tyerman, says:—

> We have the absolute declaration of Wesley himself that Erasmus never rejected any overture that he made to him, and if this were so, it follows that Erasmus did actually ordain him a bishop, or that Toplady's insinuation is calumniously untrue. To this, also, must be added the testimony of Thomas Olivers, who, with Wesley's consent, if not at his request, replied to Toplady's attack, namely, that though Mr. Wesley did get Erasmus to ordain John Jones, and though John Jones did dress as a clergyman of the Church of England, and did assist Mr. Wesley in administering the Lord's Supper in the Methodist societies, yet Wesley had authorized him (Olivers) to give the most positive and unqualified denial to the insinuation that he had asked Erasmus to ordain himself to the high office of a bishop. But [continues Olivers] suppose he had, where would have been the blame? Mr. Wesley is connected with a number of persons who have given every proof which the nature of the thing allows, that they have an inward call to preach the Gospel. Both he and they would be glad if they had an outward call too. But no bishop in England will give it to them. What wonder, then, if he was to endeavor to procure it by any other innocent means?†

Having in these quotations the substance of all that can be positively asserted in denial of the Erasmian consecration of Mr. Wesley, it remains that the denial itself be examined:—

First, It does not deny the fact of the ordination, but that Mr. Wesley had asked the Greek Bishop to ordain him. Why

* "Life of the Rev. John Wesley," American edition, note, p. 251.

† "Life and Times of Wesley," vol. ii, pp. 488, 480.

did not Mr. Wesley authorize Olivers to deny the thing itself, as well as the form of the thing?

Second, It does maintain the importance of connecting the inward call to preach the Gospel with the outward call, which both Mr. Wesley and his apologist, Mr. Olivers, regarded as securable through the ordination of a bishop, whether Anglican or Greek. If Mr. Wesley's episcopalianism went no further than some are disposed to assert, why did he ask Erasmus, as bishop, to ordain Mr. Jones, and why was he so careful to satisfy himself first as to the episcopal character of that prelate? Why should he induce a foreign ecclesiastic, contrary to the spirit of the law of his country, to perform an episcopal act that himself could have done as well if he believed that the outward call could be assured to one as truly by a presbyter as by a bishop?

The conclusion is inevitable, from Mr. Wesley's stand-point in this transaction, that a valid ministry is dependent on episcopal prerogative.

For the sake of perspicuity, an examination of Mr. Wesley's episcopalianism is herewith presented. His logic on the subject may be thus formulated: Every pastor in the Church of God, to be valid, must be constituted by the *inward call* of the Lord Jesus Christ and the *outward call* of the Church, through its episcopal head.

We apprehend that the founder of Methodism has suffered alike from friendly and hostile hands, by reason of a failure of each respectively to regard the broad distinction in Mr. Wesley's mind between the calling and work of a preacher and that of a pastor; yet in this respect his statements are clear, positive, and comprehensive. In 1789 he uttered a sermon on "The Ministerial Office." In it the distinction is purposely made between the office of an evangelist, or preacher, and that of pastor, in these words:

> The great High Priest of our profession sent apostles and evangelists to proclaim glad tidings to all the world; and then pastors, preachers, and teachers to build up in the faith the congregations that should be founded. But I do not find that ever the office of an evangelist was the same with that of a pastor, frequently called a bishop. He presided over the flock and administered the sacraments: the former assisted him, and preached the word either in one or more congregations. I cannot prove from

any part of the New Testament, or from any author of the three first centuries, that the office of an evangelist gave any man a right to act as a pastor or bishop. I believe these offices were considered as quite distinct from each other till the time of Constantine." *

Proceeding to show, by reference to the Presbyterians, to the Church of England, and to the Roman Catholics, that the office of evangelist or teacher did not imply that of a pastor, to whom peculiarly belonged the administration of the sacraments, and that authority to preach was not ordination, he gave an outline of proceedings in the Methodist societies for the half century that was then about closing.

Nothing can be clearer than the following, addressed to his preachers:—

For supposing (what I utterly deny) that the receiving you as a preacher at the same time gave an authority to administer the sacraments, yet it gave you no other authority than to do it, or any thing else, where I appoint. But where did I appoint you to do this? Nowhere at all. Therefore by this very rule you are excluded from doing it. And in doing it you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which was wholly and solely to preach the Gospel.

Again he says:—

I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England; I love her liturgy; I approve her plan of discipline, and only wish it could be put into execution. I do not knowingly vary from any rule of the Church unless in those few instances where I judge, and as far as I judge, there is an absolute necessity.

The points at which he varied are stated, being limited to five: 1.) Preaching abroad; 2.) Praying extempore; 3) Forming classes; 4.) The yearly conference; 5.) Appointing the preachers for the ensuing year.

He knew that men would think him inconsistent with himself, in saying that in varying from the Church of England he did not separate from it, and he said:—

They cannot but think so unless they observe my two principles—the one, that I dare not separate from the Church, that I believe it would be a sin to do so; the other, that I believe it would be a sin not to vary from it in the points above mentioned. . . . (Both of which I have constantly and openly avowed for up-

* Wesley's Sermon cxxxix, vol. ii, Am. Ed. 1851.

ward of fifty years) and inconsistency vanishes away. I have been true to my profession from 1730 to this day.

Observing the distinction thus made, our quest after the true position of Mr. Wesley will be facilitated by placing his teachings on the subject in two parallel columns under the captions.

LAY MINISTRY.

1745. Wesley on the employment of laymen to preach:

"In all Protestant Churches ordination is not held a necessary pre-requisite of preaching; for in Sweden, in Germany, in Holland, and, I believe, in every Reformed Church in Europe, it is not only permitted but required that before any one is ordained he shall publicly preach a year or more *ad probandum facultatem*."—*Tyerman*, i, 370.

1746. In the Conference of 1746 Mr. Wesley's lay preachers were defined to be "extraordinary messengers, designed of God to provoke others to jealousy." Three points attested their call to preach —grace, gifts, fruits.—*Ibid.* i, 527, 528.

1755. "If we cannot stop a separation without stopping lay preachers, the case is clear; we cannot stop it at all.

"But if we permit them, should we not do more? Should we not appoint them—since the bare permission puts the matter out of our hands, and deprives us of all our influence? But is it lawful for presbyters circumstanced as

ORDINATION.

1745. To Westley Hall:—"We believe it would not be right to administer either baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission so to do from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the apostles.

"We believe that the threefold order of ministers is not only authorized by its apostolical institution, but also by the written word."—*Tyerman*, i, 496.

At the third day's session of the Conference of 1745, points of Church government being debated, the question was asked, "Is episcopal, independent, or presbyterian Church government most agreeable to reason?" The answer given was that each is a development of the other. A preacher preaches and forms an independent congregation; he then forms another and another in the immediate vicinity of the first; this obliges him to appoint *deacons*, who look on the first pastor as their common father: and as these congregations increase, and as their *deacons* grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons or helpers, in respect of whom they are called *presbyters* or elders, as their father in the Lord may be called the *bishop* or overseer of them all."—*Ibid.*, p. 499.

1746. Question at the Conference held this year, "Are the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons plainly described in the New Testament?" Answer: "We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Churches of the apostolic age."—*Tyerman*, i, p. 509.

1748. Wesley alleged that the system of Quakerism differed from Christianity, (3.) "Because it sets aside ordination to the ministry by the laying on of hands."—*Tyerman's Wesley*, ii, p. 39.

we are to appoint other ministers? This is the very point wherein we desire to be advised, being afraid of leaning to our own understanding."—*Wesley's Letter to Rev. Mr. Walker. Meth. Mag.*, 1779, p. 376.

To the Rev. Thomas Adams he wrote from London, Oct. 31, 1755:

"We vary from the rules of the Church, and permit laymen whom we believe God has called to preach.

"I say *permit*, because we ourselves have hitherto viewed it in no other light. This we are clearly satisfied we *may* do; that we may do more we are not satisfied. It is not clear to us that presbyters, so circumstanced as we are, may appoint or ordain others; but it is that we may *direct*, as well as *suffer*, them to do what we conceive they are *moved to by the Holy Ghost*. It is true, that in *ordinary* cases both an inward and an outward call are requisite."

1756. "These preachers are not ministers; none of them undertakes the care of a single flock."

To Mr. Norton:—"You charge me with *self-inconsistency* in tolerating lay preaching and not lay administering." . . . "I tolerate lay preaching because I conceive there is an absolute necessity for it; yet I do not tolerate *lay administering*, because I do not conceive there is any such necessity for it."

1756. Letter of Mr. Wesley to the Rev. Mr. Clark:—

"I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture I do not believe. The plea of *divine right* for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church."

Letter to the Rev. Samuel Walker:—

"What authority have I to forbid their (lay preachers) doing what I believe God has called them to do? I apprehend, indeed, that there ought, if possible, to be both an outward and inward call to this work; yet if one of the two be supposed wanting, I had rather want the outward than the inward call."

To Mr. Norton: — "Some of our preachers who are not ordained think it quite right to administer the Lord's Supper, and believe it would do much good. I think it quite wrong, and believe it would do much hurt. You believe it is a duty to administer; do so, and therein follow your own conscience. I verily believe it is a sin, which, consequently, I dare not *tolerate;* and herein I follow mine."

1761. "In every point of an indifferent nature we obey the Bishops for conscience' sake; but we think *episcopal* authority cannot reverse what is fixed by divine authority."—*Tyerman*, ii, p. 403.

These quotations represent Mr. Wesley's views of episcopacy up to the period when, it is claimed, the Erasmian ordination was performed. There is noticeable in them that remarkable consistency which distinguished the whole course of our venerable founder's life. The only change that time and research and the most patient reflection had produced was that of his former opinion concerning diocesan episcopacy. This opinion he abandoned; but he has nowhere asserted that himself, as a presbyter in the Church of England, was authorized to appoint

or ordain ministers. Hence he did it not, although he was greatly embarrassed in his work and congregations because there were no preachers among the Methodists to assist him in administering the sacraments.

From these facts it is evident that Mr. Wesley, in 1763, was an earnest advocate of episcopal ordination as the medium of transition from the laical to the clerical state. And though, after reading and research, he was convinced that at first presbyters and bishops were of the same order, yet in all this period, amid all the agitations in regard to administering the sacraments by some of his preachers, he was not in a single instance known to have suggested, either to his brother clergymen, or to the most trusted of his preachers, the propriety of presbyterial ordination. On the contrary, he doubted whether presbyters, so situated as he and his coadjutors were, were at liberty to do more than permit and direct lay preachers.

After the most careful inquiry and comparison of his subsequent work with the transactions and management undertaken by him, we are forced to the conclusion that from the close of 1763 to the end of his life Mr. Wesley became more magisterial in the management of his societies, and episcopal in his conduct toward and with his preachers.

The year 1764 is the date of a new departure. And the most reasonable explanation that can be furnished is that with which this essay has to do—that he was vested by the consecration of Erasmus with episcopal authority.

Candor compels us to note these instances of change with some degree of precision. First of all, we find that from henceforth he assumes the sole government of the Methodist societies. His brother Charles not only ceased to be his counselor, but the intercourse between them was well-nigh broken off. He issued a "Pastoral Address," as it was denominated by Tyerman, to the societies in Bristol, over which his brother had had supervision for several years, without alluding either by name or association to his former companion and adviser.

He wrote letters to all the evangelical clergymen in England, with whom he desired to form, according to his own words, afterward uttered, "a league offensive and defensive," on the subject of Christian union, the basis of which, reduced to its simplest terms of expression, was that they should mutually

agree in teaching the cardinal doctrine of redemption, defend each other's characters when assailed, and permit him and his societies to pursue their course unfettered, though that course might be declared irregular, wholly or in part. Though he had constantly held that the Methodist societies were a part of the Church of England, yet when clergymen, acknowledged by him to be evangelical, and true spiritual leaders, proposed that Mr. Wesley should give up the sole management of the societies within their respective parishes to the duly accredited parish minister, he refused to withdraw his preachers, or to turn over the members gathered by them to the settled minister.

He asserted now for the first time that "all the Methodists throughout Great Britain and Ireland were one body." And in making this assertion there could be but the implied fact that that one body was under one head. As head of that body he "opened chapels in the sense of consecrating them," (a prerogative of the Bishop in the Church of England,) and asserted that "no other consecration of church or chapel is allowed, much less required in England, than the performance of public worship therein." He sought to cement the bond of union in his societies by the raising of a common fund, connectional in character, with which to pay the chapel debts; and in 1784, previous to his personal acts of ordination, made provision by which the Methodists, both as a conference and in their Church property, should have a legal standing in the kingdom.

In 1765 a person was sent through England to examine chapel deeds, and to appoint trustees where needed. To the Rev. Mr. Venn, the Vicar of Huddersfield, into whose ecclesiastical preserves some of Mr. Wesley's preachers had ventured, in violation of a formal compact agreed upon by them, Mr. Wesley wrote, June 22, 1765: "I want no man living, I mean none but those who are connected with me, and who bless God for that connection. With these I am able to go through every part of the work to which I am called." He intimates that the distance between himself and the reverend vicar had been increased by some who accused him of love of power, and said in reply, "The power I have never sought. It was the undesired, unexpected result of the work. . . . I am not satisfied with 'Be very civil to the Methodists, but have nothing to do with

them.' No. I desire to have a league, offensive and defensive, with every soldier of Christ." *

During the following year he sought to break down the estrangement that had grown up between him and his brother Charles, but he does not scruple in the least to style himself the head of the work. "If," says he, "I am in some sense the head, and you the heart," etc. He urges his brother's attendance upon the Leeds Conference, where the most thorough discussion of his own administrative power was had which had yet taken place. To the consideration of that point especially attention is now directed.

In answer to the question, "What power is this which you exercise over all the Methodists in Great Britain and Ireland?" he first recounts the history of the origin of the power of admitting into and excluding from the societies under his care, of choosing and removing stewards, of receiving and not receiving helpers, of appointing them when, where, and how to help him, and of selecting out of their number any whom he might desire to meet him when he deemed it good.

If men regarded it as too much power for one man to exercise, he told them he did not seek it; it came upon him unawares. He was never fond of it, but he bore it as a burden which God had laid upon him; that, in substance, if either preachers or members desired to leave him they were free to do so; "but he who stays" must do so on the same terms that existed when he joined him first.

He admitted that he exercised this power singly, without any colleagues therein.

It cannot escape observation that this complaint of Mr. Wesley's exercise of power was a new thing in the history of the Methodist societies. Hampson and others regarded it as more manifestly despotic during the last ten or fifteen years of his supremacy than before. We here have Mr. Wesley's explanation—a thing out of harmony with his life and work had there been no need for explanation.

The Conference of 1766 is further memorable as the date of the beginning of that more perfect form of keeping up a vitalized membership through systematic pastoral work. The great organizer, intent on the mighty purpose of his soul to build up

* Methodist Magazine, 1782, p. 495.

a great Church of godly members, took upon himself the development of the plan that would as certainly demand pastors for its execution as the former had demanded preachers. The Rules for Pastoral Visitation in 1766 have been the basis and substance of the rules of the Church down to the present time. Here, too, begin the series of questions proposed to every preacher on probation, before his being received into full connection, which, with unimportant omissions, are now propounded to every candidate before his admission to ordination.

In 1768 the point was raised in the yearly conference as to whether the itinerant preachers should be allowed to engage in trade. They were meagerly supported, and were without any clerical status whatever; but Mr. Wesley now regarded them as practically occupying, though not in orders, "the same position as ministers in the Church of England, and hence he considered it as unseemly and as improper for his itinerants to engage in trade as it would be for the clergy of the Established Church." They who had engaged thus were accordingly advised to give up their business.

In 1769, having at Conference referred again to the disinclination of the evangelical clergymen of the Church of England toward the Methodist movement, Mr. Wesley invited his preachers to consider upon the propriety of arranging to continue the work as a united society in the event of his death, by the selection of a proper stationing power. He set forth his own plan, and, at the request of the preachers, published the "Minutes," in which that plan was embodied, the following year. Nothing, however, seems to have come of it, and the matter gave no further concern, apparently, to Mr. Wesley until the year 1773, when he addressed a very remarkable letter to Mr. Fletcher of Madeley, the contents of which it is necessary to study most carefully.

Mr. Wesley was now seventy years of age, his health was seriously affected, and he began most earnestly to "set his house in order." He felt the importance of securing a successor for the societies under his charge. Hence the letter, from which we extract the following:—

DEAR SIR: What an amazing work has God wrought in these kingdoms in less than forty years! And it not only continues, but

increases throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland; nay, it has lately spread into New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina. But the wise men of the world say, "When Mr. Wesley drops, then all is at an end!" And so surely it will unless before God calls him hence one is found to stand in his place. For Ουκ αγαθον πολυκοιρανία. Εἷς κοιρανός εστω, (A government of many is not good. Let there be one governor.) I see more and more, unless there be one προεστώς (bishop, president, or superintendent) the work can never be carried on. The body of the preachers are not united, nor will any part of them submit to the rest, so that either there must be one to preside over all, or the work will indeed come to an end.

After mentioning the necessary qualifications for such a person, he insists that God has provided such a one.

Who is he? *Thou art the man!* God has given you a measure of loving faith, and a single eye to his glory. He has given you some knowledge of men and things, particularly of the whole plan of Methodism. . . . Come out, then, in the name of God! Come to the help of the Lord against the mighty! Come while I am alive and capable of labor! Come while I am able. God assisting, to build you up in faith, to ripen your gifts, and to introduce you to the people.*

To this significant letter Fletcher replied, promising that should God call Mr. Wesley first, he would do his best, by the Lord's assistance, to help his brother Charles "to gather the wreck, and keep together those who are not absolutely bent upon throwing away the Methodist doctrine and discipline." He further stated that he had some convictions of the propriety of taking the position of Mr. Wesley's deacon: "Not with any view of presiding over the Methodists after you, God knows, but to save you a little in your old age, and be in the way of receiving, perhaps of doing, more good."

This, then, is the conclusion to which Mr. Wesley came, a conclusion somewhat different from that indicated to the Conference four years previously, and a conclusion that leaves the later plan open to two interpretations, in accordance with the construction of the term expressed in Greek characters.

The most natural conclusion is that προεστώς was used by Mr. Wesley in the ecclesiastical sense. According to Justin Martyr the term was synonymous with επίσκοπος, αρχίερευς, ἱεράρχης.† So in the ancient Church the president of the brethren

* Tyerman, from Whitehead's Life of Wesley, vol. ii, p. 335.

† Apolog., ii, p. 67.

was considered to be the bishop. The less probable construction is that Mr. Wesley simply intended to use the term to indicate a presiding officer. Of the latter we have doubt, because of the character of the reply of Mr. Fletcher, who was in orders as well as Mr. Wesley, but who speaks of bearing the relation of deacon to Mr. Wesley, which he could not, except in the sense of a ministerial attendant on him as bishop. This was, also, in accordance with ancient Church usage, which was to regard them as adjutants of the bishops. "Let the deacon refer all these things to the bishop, as Christ did to the Father." "Such things as he is able, let him rectify by the power which he has from the bishop, just as the Lord is delegated by the Father to act and to decide; but let the bishop judge the more important cases." *

It remains to be added that both Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher were too sincere to use terms in any other sense than that appropriated to them, without explanatory clauses to fix their meaning. Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher alike, therefore, regarded our founder as a bishop, and both considered Mr. Wesley's proposition to be that of making Mr. Fletcher Bishop of the Methodists after Mr. Wesley's death. It is evident that Mr. Wesley was loth to give up the plan suggested to Mr. Fletcher, and in 1776 the latter found it necessary to utter another refusal in a letter to the former, from which we take the following:—

MADELEY, *Jan.* 9, 1776.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: . . . I could, if you wanted a traveling assistant, accompany you, as my little strength would admit, in some of your excursions; but your recommending me to the societies as one that might succeed you (should the Lord call you hence before me) is a step to which I could by no means consent. . . . It would make people suspect that what I have done for truth and conscience' sake I have done with a view of being what Mr. Toplady calls "the Bishop of Moorfields." † J. FLETCHER.

During the two following years the controversialists against Mr. Wesley frequently reiterated the charge that he had been long desirous of being made bishop.

Our investigation now introduces us to the events that, by both time and circumstance, closely connect our matter with

* Apostol. Constitutions, lib. ii, c. 44, 30.

† Tyerman's Life and Times of Wesley, iii, p. 212.

the ordinations performed by Mr. Wesley. Thus far we have not been able to find a single expression or intimation of his change of opinion in regard to episcopal ordination. The records of the next five years ought, therefore, to have a very careful study. What will they prove?

We shall find, in 1779, a lay preacher of talent, influence, and popularity, summarily dismissed from the connection by the sole act of Mr. Wesley because he resisted the latter's appointment of a certain deposed clergyman to the society in Bath, to which himself had been assigned at the previous Conference. Of Rev. Mr. Smyth, the clergyman referred to above, much could be said in praise of his Christian zeal and high ministerial qualifications, but Mr. M'Nab was his peer in every respect save in that of being found wanting in clerical orders. The setting aside of the lay preacher was peculiarly gratifying to Rev. Charles Wesley, whose spirit had for years been troubled on account of the growing popularity of the preachers, and the probability that after his brother's death they would break the societies off from the Establishment. We shall find Mr. Wesley in the following year receiving back into his ranks and his personal confidence the above preacher, "without an acknowledgment of his fault," much to the dissatisfaction of his brother. But, more especially, we shall find Mr. Wesley himself declaring his conviction on the validity of presbyterial ordination.

We turn, then, with interest to the transactions of the year 1780. Grave difficulties had fallen across the path of the Wesleyan itinerants in America. To meet a want which it seemed could not be provided for in any other way, the most serious innovations had been introduced into some of the American societies. Lay preachers had administered the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the conclusion was now to be reached that should determine whether the nine thousand Methodists in America should be deprived of the sacred ordinances of the Church, or ordained clergymen of the Church of England should be sent to them, or unordained preachers should be appointed to perform those offices, or lay preachers should be ordained by Mr. Wesley for the work. Appeal was made to the great Methodist προεστώς in England. It brought him to a declaration which has hitherto been, and is now, re-

garded by many as the corner-stone of Methodist ecclesiasticism. In a letter to his brother Charles, of June 8, 1780, he writes:—

> Read Bishop Stillingfleet's "Irenicum," or any impartial history of the ancient Church, and I believe you will think as I do. I verily believe I have as good a right to ordain as to administer the Lord's Supper. But I see abundance of reason why I should not use that right, unless I was turned out of the Church. At present we are just in our place."*

What was thought of this by his brother may be gathered from the following:—

> I am not sure they will not prevail on you to ordain them. You claim the *power*, and only say, "It is not probable you shall ever exercise it." Probability on one side implies probability on the other, and I want better security. So I am to stand by and see the ruin of our cause!

How are we to understand the letter of the 8th of June in comparison with the following, extracted from his letter to Bishop Lowth under the date of August 10 of the same year?

> Some time since I recommended to your lordship a plain man, whom I had known above twenty years, as a person of deep, genuine piety and unblamable conversation. But he neither understood Greek nor Latin; and he affirmed in so many words that "he believed it was his duty to preach, whether he was ordained or no." I believe so, too. What became of him since I know not, but I suppose he received *presbyterian ordination*; and I cannot blame him if he did. He might think any ordination better than none.

The interpretation we put upon the subject, as above presented, is that Mr. Wesley based his claim to the right to ordain, not on the ground of his being a presbyter in the Church of England, but on the higher ground of episcopal prerogative. He was not an advocate of a "presidency of order," to use the language of Bishop Stillingfleet. In the Church of England he simply regarded himself as presbyter John, with no right to ordain, in and for that Church, either the preachers under him or other candidates for holy orders. He held himself to be a bishop, (though he uses not the term officially,) because on him rested the sole management of the preachers and societies which had sprung up by virtue of his immense

* Tyerman, iii, p. 332.

activities and labors. As it was the prerogative of the bishop in the ancient Church to administer the Lord's Supper, and neither presbyters or deacons had a right to do so except by the authority of the bishop, so from the ancient Church standpoint he had, also, the co-ordinate right to ordain. He knew that presbyterian ordination would not avail for his societies while they remained members of the Church of England, and they that secured it, if any did so, left his connection.

We have almost come to the end of our investigation, without being able to find one single fact or utterance favorable to an advocacy of presbyterial ordination by Mr. Wesley. Though admission to holy orders was not declared to be invalid if performed by a presbyter, yet it is most apparent that he both preferred and advocated such admission through the hands of a duly constituted bishop. Such is the situation as we approach to the *crux ecclesiasticorum*, the ordinations performed by Mr. Wesley himself. Without giving in detail the text of the history of the ordinations of Messrs. Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey for America, of others for Scotland, and finally of others for England, we must content ourselves with the recital of the facts and their significance.

We have seen that in 1780 Mr. Wesley asserted his belief that he had the right to ordain. In 1784 for the first time he exercised that asserted right. In its exercise he pursued wholly the episcopal plan, beginning with the lowest order, the diaconate, advancing the candidate to be presbyter, and advancing the presbyter to the office of superintendent or bishop. The form of ordination, as set forth in the liturgy of the Church of England, was scrupulously observed in every stage of the proceeding, the only difference being the substitution of the terms "elder" for "presbyter," and "superintendent" for "bishop." There was no difference whatever in the powers defined as pertaining to the three classes. In the American case, there being no Bishops of the Church of England, and but few parish priests in the whole country, "so that for some hundreds of miles together there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper," he conceived that, "violating no order and invading no man's rights," he was at full liberty to appoint and send laborers into the harvest.

Two theories of these ordinations are possible: first, that,

it having been clearly proved to Mr. Wesley that in the primitive Church bishops and presbyters were the same order, he, as presbyter, exercised the same functions which pertain to the episcopate, because episcopal consecration was not essential to the validity of ecclesiastical ordination; second, that his ordinations were episcopal acts, designed and executed on the ground that he was more than a presbyter, being a bishop, "as much so as any man in England."

The maintenance of the first theory requires that it be proved that a presbyter of the Church of England in the eighteenth century was the same as a presbyter in the primitive Church. If, in the Anglican as in the primitive Church, the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" were synonymous, there is ground for belief, unless it is stated otherwise, that Mr. Wesley, being a presbyter in the former, was, by virtue of that position, "bishop," they being "of one order." But if, as all the facts show, the Anglican Church did not, and never did, regard these as "one and the same order," then Mr. Wesley's presbyterial ordination did not vest in him powers episcopal. The Anglican Church never gave to her priests authority to ordain; but all the authority they had came from that Church; therefore it is plain that an English priest could not claim authority to lay on hands or ordain to the ministry. If he did not claim to be a bishop in and of the Church of England, because of the parity of orders, he could in no sense be more than presbyter of that Church; and in and with that Church alone all his ecclesiastical authority existed.

By what secret channel did Mr. Wesley receive that power which has been denied to presbyters for forty-two generations? Whence came his authority to ordain, if he were not, as elder in the Church of England, the same character as was the primitive and apostolic elder? Would it not be quite as arduous an undertaking to prove a succession of elders from the apostles, as of bishops? Yet, if his authority came not by presbyterial succession from the apostles, on what ground could he believe himself to be vested with primitive presbyterial functions? Unlike the primitive elders, all his ecclesiastical endowments were derived and received from diocesan bishops; unlike them, he exercised jurisdiction over a parish that was bounded by neither country, national, or geograph-

ical lines—his "ecclesiastical preserves" spanned kingdoms, stepped over oceans, and were bounded only by the world's horizon; unlike the primitive elder, who came to his place by the voice of his brethren, or the parochial bishop, who held his cure through the assent of the whole body of his compeers, he assumed jurisdiction without, and regardless of, the authority of his Church and the selection of his co-presbyters; and, finally, unlike the presbyter of the primitive Church, he astonished the "Methodist connection" by himself selecting and proposing to ordain "deacon," "elder," and "superintendent," men who were to found a Church on the crumbling ruins of the ecclesiastical system to which he was attached during his whole lifetime. His act may have been apostolical, it was not presbyterial, whether primitive or Anglican.

The second theory, that Mr. Wesley's ordinations were episcopal acts, designed and executed on the ground that he was more than a presbyter, being a bishop, "as much so as any man in England," is that alone by which his ordinations can be made to appear consistent, churchly, and intelligent. Indeed, without it, these essential elements and he part company. To separate them is to perpetrate a species of moral treason of which the present writer feels himself incapable. Let him bear his burden who would brand the grandest character of the eighteenth century with epithets such as were denied by the uniform purposes of his whole life.

In his letter to his brother Charles he defended his acts of ordination in the following words:—

> Obedience I always paid to the Bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land. But I cannot see that I am under any obligation to obey them further than those laws require. It is in obedience to these laws that I have never exercised in England the power, which, I believe, God has given me. I firmly believe I am a scriptural ἐπίσκοπος, as much as any man in England or in Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove. But this does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England, from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago.

In reference to the Bishops he says, in the same letter:—

> I do, indeed, vary from them in some points of doctrine, and in some points of discipline (by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming societies,) but not a

hair's breadth further than I believe to be meet, right, and my bounden duty.

Charles Wesley, in reply, said on the points of varying, "Might you not add, and by ordaining?" Wesley did not add, "and by ordaining," because he did not believe he varied from the Bishops in doing this. Why did he not? Because he believed himself not a presbyter of the Church of England only, but Bishop of the Methodist Societies.

How was he constituted bishop? He was not consecrated by any Bishop in the Church of England, nor is there either assertion or evidence that he was chosen by the presbyters friendly to him, and ordained through their instrumentality. The preachers under him did not so choose him, nor did they have the thought that he would ordain any to the ministry. The proposition to ordain came not from them, but from Mr. Wesley himself. If he received not the authority from English Bishops, nor by the election of his co-presbyters, nor by the voice of the people under him, whence did he derive the power? How did he obtain that *outward call* without which he would neither consent for Dr. John Jones to administer the ordinances, nor countenance the same thing in the American preachers? He asserted no right to which he was not truly entitled, nor did he perform a churchly act without due qualification for it. If he was ordained Bishop by Erasmus, Bishop of Arcadia, the matter is at once clear, and his acts present no feature of embarrassment. If not thus qualified, his extraordinary acts can only be supported by the argument of an extraordinary, independent, and special call of God to him to found a new Church, under a new ecclesiastical dispensation. Then would his investiture be divine, higher than either presbyterial or episcopal prerogative, and based on neither. His providential call would not have been because he was presbyter; the Methodist Episcopal Church would have been "a new thing under the sun," the creation of Wesley himself, who must have been regarded as the seminal head, called, constituted, and divinely endowed for that purpose. The departure of the Methodist societies from the bosom and service of the Church of England would have been an exode from old ecclesiastical bondage, and the Bristol private residence where Dr. Coke received his ordination and authority, the Mount Sinai

of Methodism, where the laws, liturgy, ordinances, and regulations of the departing bondsmen were delivered and accepted. I confess that this assumption would be far more consistent than that of basing Mr. Wesley's authority for his ordinations on the ground of his being a presbyter in the Church of England. It would not be, it is true, according to the views of one of his preachers, expressed after the great event had taken place, either "episcopal or presbyterian," but it could not then be declared "a hodge-podge of inconsistencies."* It would have been a divine unfolding of God's method, in the eighteenth century, for the delivery of his spiritual Israel, and of speaking by the great Head of the Church to the nations to put on their breast-plates "Holiness to the Lord."

To sum up the result of our investigation, we have found by the letter of Dr. Peters that the allegation "that Mr. Wesley was ordained bishop by Erasmus" was not made public, though he was sure of the correctness of the charge, because of the peril which would have come to Mr. Wesley through the operation of the *Præmunire* Act. We have found the statement, further, that Dr. Seabury, of Connecticut, was so far satisfied in regard to Mr. Wesley's right to ordain to the episcopate that he was willing to be consecrated by him, and Wesley was willing to consecrate him, but not to sign his letter of order as bishop. We have found Mr. Wesley maintaining a uniform and consistent faith in reference to the order of bishop, and the prerogative of the office; that none not episcopally ordained were admitted by him to administer the sacraments in his societies, though he did not believe that all not so ordained were without authority in their own ecclesiastical organizations; that to secure the services of preachers, to assist in administering the sacraments, he only applied to Bishops of whose episcopal character he had no doubt. We have found that after the asserted Erasmian consecration there has never been a denial of the fact, but, according to Dr. Peters' statement, a strongly implied admission, that Mr. Wesley's acts from 1763 to the close of his life became more episcopal, and had their culmination in the ordination of 1784, and the following years; that he did not claim that he had the power to ordain previous to 1763, though he had read Lord King's work on the primi-

* Whitehead's Life of Wesley, vol. ii, p. 419.

tive Church, nearly twenty years before, and Stillingfleet's Irenicum soon after its publication. We have found that immediately after 1763 he promulged the idea of the unity of all the Methodist societies, in England, Scotland, Ireland, and subsequently in America; that he assumed the sole government of them, checking the aspirations of the preachers, and standing aloof from the counsel of his brother Charles; that he began immediately, too, to discipline his preachers in pastoral work, making their only deficiency, for several years, to be a want of holy orders. We have found him assuming a title of office known in the primitive Church to be applied only to a bishop, and inviting Mr. Fletcher to become his successor therein. We have, finally, found him ordaining to the offices of "deacon," "elder," and "superintendent," and recognizing the three separate orders as valid, true, scriptural, and proper, by virtue of authority not derived from the Church of England, which he felt himself to be "providentially" called upon to exercise.

Had it been formally announced in the Conference of 1764 that in December, 1763, Erasmus of Crete had ordained John Wesley Bishop of the Methodist Societies in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and had he then assumed publicly the title, his subsequent course in the management of his societies would have varied but little, if at all.

---

## Art. VI.—BISHOP BAKER.

We first saw Baker in the spring of 1828. He had come down from one of the good old towns of New Hampshire, to commence, at Wilbraham, a course of liberal education. He seemed a retiring and amiable youth, of soft speech and gentle ways—not specially social and communicative, save to a select few, to whom, however, he was not backward to converse of his youthful sentiments, trials, and sorrows. His health was not firm and perfect, and a secret infirmity attached itself to him in those days, and which, in fact, was chronic, adhering to him through life, and very possibly contributing to his early decline. Few, doubtless, suspected any such disability, as they have looked upon the apparently robust form and the counte-

nance, so bland and fresh, of his mature manhood. But there were those who saw beneath the outward and the visible, and who knew that this seemingly strong man was, after all, but delicately constituted—that he was ill-adapted to protracted and stern endurance; and who were not surprised that the far reaching travels, the arduous conference sessions, the countless, intricate questions to be officially settled, and the weary labors and exertions generally incidental to the Methodist episcopacy, should prove a burden too heavy and severe to be long sustained by one physically and mentally organized as was Bishop Baker.

At the academy he was diligently and successfully prosecuting his preparatory studies when there came suddenly down upon that company of young men and maidens a remarkable baptism of the Holy Spirit. Of the antecedents of this revival we retain, unfortunately, no very distinct remembrance. Certain devout and excellent young men were there, such as John W. Merrill, Jefferson Haskall, Mosely Dwight, Otis Wilder, Joel Knight, Horace Moulton, Graves, Stocking, and others—all of whom were looking toward the ministry, and whose bearing and example before their fellow-students were without reproach. It was a goodly company for young Baker—not yet a Christian youth—to meet, as he came thither for study; and it was salutary for him to note their wholesome example, and listen to their prayers and to their affecting and earnest addresses and exhortations to flee from the wrath to come and lay hold on eternal life. And when the sacred influences fell, as the dew of heaven, upon that youthful crowd, Baker was not among the last to yield and be saved. Then it was that he and his life-long friend, David Patten, side by side, together bowed to the ever-glorious Redeemer, and, arm in arm, started on their Christian career. Clear and brilliant was his conversion. It had the seeming of a sudden uprising from darkness to light—from tears to smiles—from depression and distress to joy unspeakable. And we remember how that subsequently along that beautiful spring he walked in "newness of life"—how he delighted in the ways of the Lord, and with a glad heart and luminous countenance and sprightly step he participated in the little missionary excursions to the mountain neighborhoods, or along the pleasant plains stretching away

from the academy toward the setting sun. "He's a real soldier," whispered one, as, on one of these excursions, Baker, with quick and gladsome step, was walking in advance of us. He drank, amid those happy days, of the joys of salvation, and seemed, at times, in haste to tell the story all abroad.

Happy for this young man, as well as for many others, that at this special period of his life, and for several years afterward, he was providentially thrown amid the sacred influences emanating from that model Christian gentleman and bright ornament of humanity, Wilbur Fisk. At the academy, and afterward at the university, this great and good man was the presiding genius, toward whom Baker looked with a careful eye and with an admiration and veneration that never diminished and never grew weary. Fisk knew him, watched him, and loved him; and would, at times, steal in unawares when, in one or another suburb of Middletown, Baker was addressing some little assembly, and would there listen to his virgin efforts at preaching.

Summer came, and with it came the close of that memorable term at Wilbraham. Henceforth, for a series of years, Osmon C. Baker and the writer of this sketch were separated—the one prosecuting study at the Middletown University, the other, at Bowdoin College. We subsequently joined hands again at Newbury, Vt., for organizing and conducting the new seminary just established there. Baker, though still a youth, had come up to the stature and aspect of a portly and handsome man—his general appearance being much as it was along his subsequent and maturer years. He stood at six feet, his face full and florid, his eyes protected by spectacles, his hair black, his bearing gentle and sober, and characterized by a calm dignity joined with a pleasant and unaffected urbanity. His was then, and always, a genial and attractive presence, and a stranger who might chance to meet him and look up into his calm and quiet face would be likely to look again, or, perchance, inquire who he might be. More than one who had seen the late excellent Professor Upham, of Bowdoin College, remarked the general resemblance between him and Baker. Nor was the likeness of the two men merely physical. They were similar in many of their modest and retiring ways, in their deeply respectful bearing toward those with whom they

were called to associate, in their indifference to the fashions and attractions of the world, in that profound humility wherein was their daily and hourly walk, in the careful watch constantly maintained at "the door of their lips"—so that few were the unadvised or foolish words they ever uttered, and few the disparaging remarks they ever indulged touching a neighbor or an enemy.

As Baker came to Newbury there stood at his side the one who had given herself to be his life-companion and the sharer of his prosperity and adversity, of his sorrows and his honors. Of this lady, who still survives, it might seem ungraceful to say much; but so much we feel bound to write, namely, that years of observation and pleasant acquaintance could not fail to impress us that had O. C. Baker sought the world over for one very exactly adapted to his taste, or wants, or the varied circumstances attendant upon his life, he could not have succeeded better than in the choice of a wife which he actually made.

And so the new seminary was launched, classes formed, and labors assigned. With commendable energy and courage, and with characteristic prudence and wisdom, did Baker address himself to the arduous labors that awaited him. He was, from the beginning, a competent, popular, and successful teacher and lecturer. Whatever might be the branch of study that devolved upon him to teach, he spared no pains to qualify himself for his task. His previous or general acquaintance with the study could not satisfy him. He was fain to reach out and gather facts and illustrations, sparing no pains that he might be able to present to his pupils the fullest knowledge possible of the subject in hand. That thorough conscientiousness which marked his whole life seemed specially prominent with him as a teacher of youth. In his mind and heart there lived a keen sense of *duty* which he owed to his classes. Instruction was not with him a mere routine to be begun and ended. He would do his whole part toward forming as well as informing the minds of the youth before him, and in shaping and qualifying them for the realization of a happy and noble future. And, cherishing such views as these, not only did he lay himself out for a faithful and complete performance of his work, but he loved that work with the love of an enthu-

siast, while he prosecuted it with the pure and elevated motives of a Christian. His appropriate business was his delight, and it was with difficulty that he could be diverted from what he contemplated as his high calling. Though entirely respectable as a preacher, and as such always acquitting himself well, yet, during those years in which he was occupied as a teacher, whether in the seminary or in the institute, there ever seemed with him a backwardness to entering the pulpit. Hence, with sympathies warm and gentle as those of a woman toward his ministerial brethren, he was, however, wont to shrink from their solicitations to aid in their pulpit labors, and always seemed to evince a decided preference that "the preachers should do their own preaching."

Herein, in fact, might have been seen a prominent characteristic of the man. He craved to be a man of one work, and to one work he sought to dedicate all the talents and energies with which he was endowed, esteeming that therein lay his province and his duty, and that he was incompetent or unable for much that was external to his profession. And this, it seems almost superfluous to add, was one of the grand secrets of his success. This it was that enabled him to stand almost unrivaled as a teacher in any branch of study to which he gave his attention, and in which he undertook to impart instruction. Fruitful of invention, apt and ample in illustration, indefatigable in research, charged with a generous enthusiasm, inspired with a single aim, and prompted to a full and firm endeavor, he came to his classes possessed of conscious strength for his work, and with a complete mastery of the business before him. Strong was he as a teacher, yet, as he taught, there was no affectation of strength—no needless ostentation of ability or learning. True, there were in that lecture-room animation, vivacity, assurance, sunshine; but, withal, the same calmness, the same gentle, affable spirit, that marked him in his general intercourse and habits elsewhere.

Of Baker as a preacher, it is no disparagement to say that he was less distinguished here than as a teacher. It must be remembered that preaching was not his delight, as was teaching; nor were his natural gifts in that direction equal to those that fitted him to shine so conspicuously in the professor's chair. It should be also remembered that most of his public life prior

to his election to the episcopacy was devoted to teaching—a calling which, when long and earnestly pursued, is discerned to induce habits of thought, expression, and manner generally not precisely favorable to that special style of preaching most agreeable to the popular taste. The truly eloquent and popular preacher is ordinarily one with whom preaching is a familiar and regular exercise, and not a mere occasional or incidental effort. This preacher has preaching for his great calling and work. He preaches often, and loves to preach. He preaches the *word*—the great word of life and salvation—in distinction from a mere intellectual deliverance, whether scientific, philosophical, ethical, or even religious. He communes much and long with the Holy Scriptures, and dwells amid the heavenly baptismal influences, and walks with God, and has the wondrous salvation of the Gospel as his own heart experience from day to day, and loves God with all his heart, and loves his race with a love which many waters cannot quench. Somewhere here lies the secret of truly great and eloquent preaching. The Wesleys, and Whitefield, and Fletcher, all understood and exemplified it, and so have a goodly number of their sons in the gospel, dead and living. But, alas! not all are such preachers—we fear, not the majority; not all, even, of those whom the multitude deem the most eloquent and able.

The preaching of Baker might have been justly characterized as sound in sentiment, orderly in arrangement, chaste and correct in style, clear and distinct in statement, pertinent in illustration, convincing in argumentation, and sober and dignified in delivery. As he preached there was discernible very little of chaff among the wheat, very few confused or unmeaning remarks. He was but slightly given to anecdote; he never, in preaching, we believe, awakened a smile, and he seldom extorted a tear. His demeanor in the pulpit was faultless; he was there perfectly himself, assuming no airs, indulging no violent gestures, and evincing no constraint or uneasiness—with attitude firm and dignified, a voice clear and musical, yet, under excitement, often soaring and rapid as he rounded to the close of his sermon. On the whole, he was no mean preacher, but one to whom thoughtful men and women were wont to listen with interest, and often with delight, as the earnest and faithful message issued from his lips. For if Baker

was wanting in one or another of the more showy and popular elements of a great and eloquent preacher, he was far from any lack in what must be reckoned as the basis of all truly excellent preaching. He was well read and sound as a theologian. He had found time for a careful study of Christian doctrine generally, and was specially conversant with all the prominent writers of his own Church, possessing himself of a thorough understanding of their sentiments and spirit; and if, in his labors at the institute, the department of theology had devolved upon him, instead of the one he so ably sustained, his light would have shone there with at least an equal radiance and brilliancy.

Ten years of his early manhood did Baker devote to the labor of instruction at Newbury Seminary, having during the latter half of that term of time the principalship of the institution. They were years of great and severe labors, and it seems needless to add that, in all his relations to the seminary, he acquitted himself honorably and well, and, retiring from the school, he failed not to leave there a name fragrant with a thousand beautiful memories. A few years as pastor and presiding elder succeeded, when Baker received an imperative call to a professorship in the Biblical Institute, then just commencing its eventful career. This enterprise was new in American Methodism, and, as was very natural, was not without opposition even in high places and among the truly excellent of the ministry and membership of the Church. At the same time it had, on the other hand, strong and determined advocates. Such men as Abel Stevens, Charles K. True, James Porter, and others, were among the earliest to take up their pens in its favor. Meanwhile, the great question came presently into discussion in the several New England Conferences, where slowly yet surely the object commended itself to the understandings and hearts of the ministry, and opposition to a similar extent yielded or became silent.

That man of mark, John Dempster, had long cherished in his heart of hearts the idea of a biblical and theological school for the benefit of the Methodist ministry, and was now girding himself for its realization with all that calm yet determined and indomitable energy for which he was so distinguished. Passing from conference to conference, he stood up

in the presence of his brethren, and with his clear, solemn, and stirring eloquence he unfolded, in masterly argument and forceful illustration, the genuine philosophy lying at the foundation of such a school of the prophets as was in contemplation. His efforts were not in vain. The school arose into existence — arose amid strugglings and difficulties, yet under favorable auspices, for Dempster and Baker were its earliest professors and guides.

Here, in this his new professorship, the real ability and strength of Baker shone forth with genuine and unsullied brilliancy. He was no longer a youth, and no novice in the great work of instruction. He was a veteran, rather; had seen long and arduous service in the momentous business of training and instructing youthful minds. Moreover, he had been a faithful student of the various learning adapted to the sacred calling, and had, for several years, been exercising himself in the active ministry. Thus he came to his new work laden with the rich experience and practical knowledge which contributed so largely to fit him for the duties appertaining to his sacred profession. The Homiletical Department of studies and exercises came mainly under his supervision, including a thorough examination of the Methodist polity, spirit, and usages; and in this class of studies few men in the Church were more fully competent to guide, instruct, and counsel candidates for the Methodist ministry. It was in connection with these lectures that his work on the Discipline gradually took shape, and grew into the admirable treatise which he published shortly after entering the episcopacy. This, the only extended literary effort which he saw fit to give to the world, presents a clear and full digest and illustration of what may be termed *Methodist law*, and deservedly received from the press of the Church the highest commendation.

It was not long after entering upon his labors at the institute before, from various quarters, were evident pointings toward Professor Baker as a candidate for the episcopacy. His present position brought him more prominently to the notice of influential ministers in and out of New England, who could hardly fail to discern in him several special qualifications for the high office alluded to. Thus, in connection with this office, his name, with others, began to be frequently agitated in min-

isterial circles; and when the General Conference of 1852 had assembled, at which several bishops would be necessarily elected, Baker's name was soon observed to hold special prominence as the New England candidate. The election occurring, he, with three other candidates, Scott, Simpson, and Ames, were chosen on the first balloting.

It is quite possible, if not entirely certain, that Baker, on taking his seat in that Conference, entertained little or no expectation of such an election. We think he had no aspirations for the office, for he seemed never to aspire to any office, and certainly never sought promotion. He seemed, rather, always to love to walk in lowly paths, and to feel a shrinking from new and heavy responsibilities. He was contented as a simple teacher, and asked for no principalship. He was contented as a pastor, and sought no presiding eldership. And so he was contented as a professor, and sought no bishopric. And, pending his assumption of that highest office in American Methodism, with its attendant responsibilities, it certainly seemed to those who had been long acquainted with his modest pretensions, and his dread of public notice and public station, that the solemn weight of the new duties to which he was now called would prove almost too fearful for endurance. Yet this was a mistake. This new and modest Bishop walked up amid his fresh and untried obligations and labors with a firm and deliberate step. No shrinking or tremor was visible. He seemed to be at once familiar with the new situation, and conscious of ample strength to occupy and honor it. Taking his turn, presently, to preside over that great Conference in which he was quietly sitting, the other day, as one of its members, he had all the seeming of perfect self-possession; and, though the youngest Bishop, we believe, that ever stood before such a Conference, there was apparent an entire familiarity with all the rules governing the presiding officer, and a promptness in their observance, accompanied with a propriety and dignity of bearing and demeanor such as surprised his friends, and confirmed their assurance of his capability for his new position and obligations.

And so did Bishop Baker go forth to grapple with his untried and grave duties as one of the superintendents of the great Methodist Episcopal Church. With what wisdom, en-

ergy, fidelity, diligence, ability, and promptitude, he labored in his new and widely extended field of toil and sacrifice, and with what uniform gentleness, affability, sympathy, and brotherly affection, he bore himself in all his intercourse, official and unofficial, with his brethren, needs not to be detailed here. He, doubtless, knew and felt that he was a Bishop of a great and powerful Church; he shut not his eyes to the sacredness and dignity of his position. At the same time, his characteristic humility, modesty, and simplicity never forsook him. He persisted in remaining a man among men, a brother among brethren, delighting to be reckoned a servant of the disciples, and deeming himself, we doubt not, among the least of them all.

To us, short-sighted mortals, incapable of seeing afar, it seemed a wondrous pity that such a man and such a Bishop should be so early removed from the Church and the world. Painfully pleasant is it to think of Bishop Baker as having been destined, in providence, to tarry long on the earth; to have passed on to a green and vigorous old age—his intellect clear and strong as ever, his form still erect and full, his step still firm and dignified, his old and whitened head still uplifted among his brethren, his beautiful smiles still beaming sunshine around him, his voice still firm in speech and song, and his venerable and noble presence a blessing to see!

But paint not the picture: it was never to be seen or admired. "His sun has gone down while it was yet day;" and it is better to think of him as away, somewhere, in the heavenly Paradise, communing, it may be, with Fisk and other beautiful spirits that ascended aforetime; and mingling with the angels—perchance "a little lower than they;" and, like Daniel, the greatly beloved, "standing in his lot till the end of the days."

"O, though oft depressed and lonely,
All my fears are laid aside,
If I but remember only,
Such as these have lived and died!"

## Art. VII.—PHILO, THE JEW.

No funeral *cortége* was ever seen more splendid than that which conveyed the remains of one of the greatest intellects whose influence the world has ever felt—of the mightiest conqueror of all time. What grander sight than this golden car, drawn by sixty-four mules, each with its golden cover and golden bells, as it moved slowly from Chaldæa across desert and mountain, through the hills and vales of Palestine, to carry its precious deposit to the tomb which gave to the whole quarter of Alexandria where it stood the name of "The Body." That tomb has gradually dwindled away to a wretched Mussulman chapel, kept by an aged crone, who watches over a humble shrine called "The Grave of Iskander." But the whole world was long filled, according to the emphatic saying of Demades, "with the odor of that interment."*

Two years previously (B. C. 331) this master mind, then in the apparent vigor of his manhood, had stood upon the spot whither his remains were now brought for a final resting. He was then on a rapid journey to the oasis of Ammon;† but, as with the eagle's glance, his discerning eye beheld in the little fishing town of Rhacotes the possibility of creating that which hitherto the eastern shores of the Mediterranean had entirely lacked—a magnificent harbor. The low, level reef of the Isle of Pharos furnished the opportunity—when connected with the mainland by a mole—of such a shelter for ships as neither Tyre, nor Sidon, nor Joppa had ever been able to afford. And beyond this magnificent harbor the mighty conqueror perceived the city which should constitute the capital of his vast empire, the point of union of two, or, rather, of three worlds; the place where Europe, Asia, and Africa were to meet and hold communion.

A glance at the map will show what an *ὀμφάλὸς γῆς*—a center of the world—this Alexandria is, and perhaps arouse the suspicion that it has not yet fulfilled its whole destiny, but may become at any time a prize for contending nations, or the center of some world-wide empire to come.‡ Communicating

* Grote, Hist. of Greece, xii, 346. † Sharpe, Hist. of Egypt, i, 220, *et al.*

‡ Readers of history need not to be reminded of the flourishing condition of Alexandria in the early Christian period, and how, until the establishment of the

with Europe and the Levant by the Mediterranean, with India by the Red Sea, it is certain of boundless supplies of food from the desert-guarded valley of the Nile, to which it forms the only key, thus keeping all Egypt, as it were, for its own private farm.*

Though Alexander was not destined to carry out his own magnificent schemes, but was obliged to leave them for execution to his most intimate friend, companion-in-arms, and once even the saviour of his life—the great Ptolemy—posterity failed not to acknowledge their author; and the first Ptolemy himself earned most worthily his distinctions by the zealous manner in which he repaid his royal master and lifelong associate by giving the city the name of its projector. And why should he not have done so? Not Constantine was more identified with the city on the shores of the Bosphorus than was Alexander with that at the mouth of the Nile. His friend Hephestion became its guardian hero. The military cloak of Alexander supplied its outline. It was his own plan for Babylon resuscitated; even the rectangular streets of the Asiatic capital were reproduced.† In the later Jewish phraseology it even bore the name of Babylon.‡

Besides, was it not this self-same Alexander who had made possible the establishment of the world's capital, and in this place? Had he not paved the way by effecting the union of the European and Asiatic races under one empire, leading to the spread of the Greek language as the common vehicle of communication in the Eastern, and, ultimately, in the whole civilized world? It was a striking remark of Hegel§ that Greece, the blooming youth of the world, came in with the youth Achilles and went out with the youth Alexander. But if Grecian history died with Alexander, Grecian influence was created by him. If Hellas ceased, Hellenism, the spirit of the Greek race throughout the Eastern world, at least, began its career with the conquests of Alexander.‖

Saracen power even, it rivaled Constantinople as the capital of the world by the almost fabulous wealth of its 600,000 inhabitants. It boasted the splendor of 4,0[illegible] palaces, the luxury of 5,000 baths, and provided for entertainment to the number of 400 theaters. See Sharpe, History of Egypt, (revised edition, 1877.)

* Kingsley, Alexandria and Her Schools, p. 61.

† Stanley, Jewish Church, iii, 269.

‡ Surenhusius, Mishna, v, 240.

§ Philosophy of History, p. 233.

‖ Stanley, Jewish Church, iii, 261.

It is true, Hellenism, as it was carried over the world by the armies of Alexander, was already exhausted and faded. Alexander, though a disciple of Aristotle, was himself a wild graft upon the olive-tree of Hellenism; and whatever he intended to consummate by the force of his arms was, undoubtedly, less the dissemination of the Grecian spirit than the subjection of the nations under his rule. Nevertheless, a Grecian culture went along with him, which, although pretty well antiquated, was yet new to those countries. Indeed, Plutarch looked upon it as the great mission of Alexander to transplant Grecian culture into distant countries,* and to conciliate and fuse into one Greeks and barbarians. He says of him, not without reason, that he was sent of God for this purpose,† though he did not divine that this end itself was to be only subsidiary to, and the means of, a higher—to make the united peoples of the East and West more accessible for the new creation that was to proceed from Christianity, and, in the combination of the elements of Oriental and Hellenic culture, to prepare for Christianity a material in which it might develop itself.

Whatever Alexander's motive elsewhere, at the transforming of Rhacotis he sought to establish the highest forms of Greek civilization, and to produce an intellectual condition that should be the rival of Athens in her proudest day. Mind this distinguished disciple of the illustrious Aristotle but too well knew to have been the power of the Greeks; and in this African city, to become the center of the three continents of the then known earth, the Greek philosopher and Hebrew theologian were invited to take their abode, and labor until Hellenism and Judaism would effect an indissoluble union, and the world be given not only a common capital and a common language, but also a common faith.

Under the Ptolemies this desire was given a practical application. And yet the outcome of all the Ptolemæan appliances was of little or no account, if we except the great collection of manuscripts and art treasures. The wisest men, though gathered in from the most learned centers of the world, failed to produce any thing that was really worth preserving. True,

* Τὰ βαρβαρικὰ τοῖς ἑλληνικοῖς κεράσαι, καὶ τὴν ἑλλάδα σπεῖραι. See Plutarch's *I. Orat. de Alex. virtute s. fortuna*, § 10.

† Κοινὸς ἥκειν θεοῦεν ἁρμοστὴς καὶ διαλλακτὴς τῶν ὅλων νομίζων. L. c. c. 6.

Grecian culture became a new element of life, but without being able to exhibit a creative power to effect healthful productions. In this new Grecian home ancient custom was adhered to; learned critical investigation and research were indulged in with the desire to adopt and reproduce the external form of ancient science and learning; there existed a pedantic, would-be learning, which was not fertilized by a native scientific energy. In physics they did but little at Alexandria; in art, nothing; in metaphysics, less than nothing. Says Kingsley:—

> You must not suppose that the philosophers whom the Ptolemies collected (as they would any other marketable article) by liberal offers of pay and patronage were such men as the old Seven Sages of Greece, or as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. In these three last, indeed, Greek thought reached not merely its greatest height, but the edge of a precipice, down which it rolled headlong after their decease. . . . When the Romans destroyed Greece God was just and merciful. The eagles were gathered together only because the carrion needed to be removed from the face of God's earth. And at the time of which I now speak the signs of approaching death were fearfully apparent. Hapless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingcraft and the crafts of this world, and the art of profiting by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic—"how one thing cannot be predicated of another," or "how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it," and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men . . . during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian era, when was fast approaching that dark chaos of unbelief and unrighteousness which Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, even the natural instincts themselves perverted; that chaos whose darkness Juvenal and Petronius and Tacitus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate, though more righteous Jew.—Pp. 55–63.

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation very gradually became closely intermingled with them, and from this race-mixture came that superior product which gave

to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria Grecian spirit, as we have seen, was in an exhausted and faded condition; but together with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to make their homes in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment then and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliating policy, and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that this city became a center of Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbins were called "the light of Israel."*

The commercial enterprise of the race, never since extinct, now for the first time found an outlet. The Jews gradually became a separate community under their own chief, entitled ethnarch or alabarch, and represented more than a third of Alexandria, with a council corresponding to that which ultimately ruled at Jerusalem. This was the only settlement of permanent interest. Other colonies may be traced here and there under the Ptolemæan rule, in insulated fragments. One was the band of Samaritans,† who, still keeping up their deadly feud, retired to the Thebaid. Another was the group of Anchorites by the Lake Mareotis, forerunners of the parents of Christian monasticism. Another powerful community was settled at Cyrene—just become a dependency on Egypt—destined to react on the nation in Palestine ‡ by their special synagogue at Jerusalem. Another, still in the future, but drawn by the same friendly influence of the Greco-Egyptian dynasty, was the settlement at Leontopolis. In a word, the Jews had established for themselves a home in Egypt. Whether they emigrated thither only with Alexander, or whether some refugees had already gone there with Jeremiah after the dissolution of the Judæan Commonwealth, we will not investigate; they were there under the Ptolemies, fully nationalized and naturalized. Whatever there was of Grecian learning at Alexandria was brought to the very doors of the Israelite community. The museum, with its unique library, the scholars who frequented the court—Euclid the

* Herzfeld, *Geschichte Israels*, iii, 437, *et al.*

† Josephus, *Ant.*, xi, 8.

‡ Acts ii, 1; vi, 1; Herzfeld, iii, 321.

geometrician; Apelles, the painter; Eratosthenes, the grammarian—all ministered joyfully and created a most fostering atmosphere.* Soon the Grecian tongue was their language, which they employed not only in their daily life, but also in their religion, the *Jewish religion.* They went so far that they erected for themselves a temple at Leontopolis, a city in the Province of Heliopolis, which was a copy of the temple at Jerusalem. They did so not to secede from Jerusalem, to break off all connection with their mother country, but with the full consciousness that they belonged entirely to the country in which they lived, and because they desired there to fully gratify their religious wants. This temple was called, after its founder, the *Temple of Onias;* and though it was not fully recognized in Palestine, it was, nevertheless, not condemned as an idolatrous undertaking.† The temple was a visible habitation, but the spirit, the doctrine, was of far higher importance; this, too, must needs be made accessible to them in Hellenism in the Grecian language, and so the translation of the Bible was undertaken. It is true, the work was not indispensable and the need not immediate. They had not yet altogether been estranged from the Hebrew language; but, at all events, they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have mastered the book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them.‡

Once the feat accomplished, the great translation had, the Jewish community would not content themselves with ascribing to so great a work so humble an origin, and so they accounted for its existence in a legendary dress. The story took two forms. One was that King Ptolemy Philadelphus, wishing to discover the difference between the Jews and the Samaritans, summoned § five translators—three representing the Samaritans, one Jew, and one assessor. The Samaritans undertook the Pentateuch, the Jew the later books, and the king approved the Samaritan version. This was, doubtless, the

* Sharpe, *Egypt*, vii; Herzfeld, iii, 446–458.

† Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iii, ch. 5. ‡ Geiger, *Judaism*, I, 146.

§ The number five also appears in the Talmudic traditions (*Sopherim*, i. 7.) quoted in Herzfeld, iii, 536. Two names were connected with the work by tradition—Aristobulus with Exodus, Lysimachus with Esther. (Grätz, iii, 35).

Samaritan tradition. It points to the gradual growth of the work. It also may connect itself with the venerable high-priest Hezekiah,* whom Hecatæus met in Egypt, and who appears to have been the chief of the sacerdotal order, not in Jerusalem, but in Samaria. The larger story † is that of which the full account is given in the letter ascribed to Aristeas, a courtier of Ptolemy II. This account rose above the level of the sectarian differences of Jew and Samaritan, and attached itself to the wide sympathies of the great patrons of Gentile literature:

Ptolemy Philadelphus (thus ran the tale) was resolved to enrich his new library by so important a treasure as an intelligible version of the sacred books of so large a class of his subjects. Seventy-two delegates were sent from the high-priest at Jerusalem—it may be, as in the story, so as to give six from each of the twelve tribes, or in order to correspond to the sum total of the Jewish Council, or in accordance with the mystic number which pervades this and other Eastern stories.‡ A long catalogue existed of the splendid tables, cisterns, and bowls, which Josephus § describes as if he had seen them, and which are said to have been sent by Ptolemy at this time as presents to conciliate the Jewish high-priest to the work. A local tradition long pointed out the island of the Pharian light-house as the scene of their labors. There, it was believed, they pursued their work, withdrawn in that seagirt fortress from the turmoil of the streets of Alexandria, and with the opportunity of performing every morning their religious ablutions in the sea which washed their thresholds—and on the shore of which, as late as the second century, were shown the remains of the seventy,‖ or the thirty-six, cells in which the translators had been lodged, and in which (so the later Alexandrian tradition maintained) each produced by miracle exactly the same inspired version as all the rest, without one error or contradiction.

The very story, fictitious as it may be,¶ of the splendor of the reception of the translators at Alexandria, indicates the

* Josephus, *C. Ap.* Herzfeld (iii, 538) founds this conjecture on the facts. (1) that no Jewish Hezekiah is known at this time; (2) that the Samaritan high-priest in Alexander's time was Hezekiah; (3) that Hecatæus never distinguishes between the Jews and Samaritans.

† "The letter of Aristeas to Philocrates" is given in Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus*, pp. i–xxvi. For the discussions of details see *ibid.*, 1–9; Ewald, v, 249; Kuenen, iii, 171; Herzfeld. iii, 545.

‡ See Ewald, v, 252. § Josephus. *Ant.*, xii, 2, 7, 8, 9.

‖ Justin (*Cohort. ad Græcos*, c. 34) saw the seventy cells. Epiphanes. *De Pond. et Mens.*, c. vii, viii. speaks of thirty-six cells, in which they were lodged, two and two, with two scribes to each. (Comp. Irenæus, *Adv. Iher.*, iii, 24.)

¶ See Ewald, History of the Jews, v, 253.

pride which was taken in the work. The eagerness of the tradition to connect the translation with the Grecian king and his universal library shows how gladly it was welcomed as a bridge between the Jewish and the Gentile world. The fantastic addition, which was made in Christian times, of the preternatural inspiration of the seventy translators, shows how readily the new takes the place of the old, and exhibits in the most striking form the transference, which has again and again occurred, of the same reverence—it may be even of the same superstition—for the new version as had formerly clung with exclusive attachment to the old.

If ever there was a translation which by its importance rose to a level with the original, it was this. It was not the original Hebrew, but the Septuagint translation, through which the religious truths of Judaism became known to the Greek and the Roman. It was the Septuagint which was the Bible of the evangelists and apostles in the first century, and of the Christian Church for the first age of its existence, which is still the only recognized authorized text of the Eastern Church, and the basis of the only authorized text of the Latin Church. Widely as it differs from the Hebrew Scriptures in form, in substance, in chronology, in language—unequal, imperfect, grotesque, as are its renderings—it has, nevertheless, through large periods of ecclesiastical history, rivaled, if not superseded, those Scriptures themselves. This substitution was, no doubt, in great measure based on the fable of the miraculous accuracy of the translation, and has led to the strongest theological confusions in the treatment of the Bible by the older Churches—which thus claim for two contradictory texts the same authority, and avowedly prefer the translation to the original.

But still, if "the noble army of translators," as they have been sometimes called, may look with affectionate veneration on Jerome's cell of Bethlehem, on Luther's study in the castle of the Wartburg, on the Jerusalem Chamber, where twice over the majestic language of the English Bible has been revised: yet the place of their most sacred pilgrimage should be the narrow, rocky islet of the Alexandrian harbor, where was kindled a brighter and more enduring beacon in the intellectual and religious sphere than even the world-renowned Pharos, which, in the maritime world, has been the parent of all the

lights that, from shore to shore and sea to sea, have guided the mariners of two thousand years.

We do not propose to follow their labor into detail, or to give the various instances of the liberties taken with the sacred text—lengthening the chronology to suit the more exacting claims of Egyptian science, softening the anthropomorphic representations of the Divinity to meet the requirements of Grecian philosophy. But we do wish to point out more clearly than we have yet done the importance of this undertaking to the literary history of that time and of the periods immediately succeeding. By the acceptance of such a version, if not by an open avowal of its need, the Jews acknowledged that Hebrew literature had come to an end. If here and there a fresh Hebrew book or a fresh Hebrew psalm might be added, their entrance was more or less covert, ambiguous, and questionable. Just as the fall of the Jewish monarchy broke into pieces the civil unity of the nation, so the abandonment of the Hebrew tongue broke into pieces the religious unity of Judaism. The Jewish race now entered the vast world of Hellenism. Henceforth any book which should win its way must be written in Greek, and not in Hebrew.* And if this was required of secular literature, it was indispensable in sacred books, for they could no longer find incorporation in any other than the Greek Bible. The tents of Shem were closed, but the doors of Japheth were expanded with a never-ending enlargement. The first pages of this Greek volume began with the Grecian translation of the Pentateuch; but its last pages were not closed until they had included the last of the writings which bore the name of St. John. This was the chief outward bond between the Jewish and the Christian Scripture. By this unity of the sacred language the beginning and end of the sacred literature were indissolubly united: and not only so, but by its intervention was filled the gap between the Old and the New Testament, thus veiling their differences under the common garb of Greek.

Into that vacant space, clothed in the same language, stole in those Greek books which in the Latin Church have been called "Deutero-canonical," and in the Protestant Churches "Apocryphal," but which in the early ages of Christianity were

* Stanley, iii, 298.

blended, under the common sanction of the Septuagint, with the earlier books, which closed with Malachi, the Chronicles, or Daniel, according to the varying order in which the Hebrew books were arranged.*

The introduction of these writings into the very heart of the ancient Scriptures has had wider consequences than is often recognized. First, it must be conceded that the effect of such additions as were made to the mixed volume, on which the religious system known as Christianity is founded, was extremely debasing, for the books of this canon partook largely of the enfeebled style, the exaggerated rhetoric, the legendary extravagance, and the rigid exclusiveness which characterized the history and literature of the nation after the return from the captivity. But, on the other hand, it should also be remembered that these additional writings—if you please, "uncanonical"—are invaluable, not only as keeping alive the continuity of the sacred literature, for they open, as it were, a postern-door into the charmed circle of the sacred books,† but also because they are, in a large measure, the preludings of a high philosophy and faith.

This is especially true of two of these writings, towering above the rest, and which, even by those who most disparage the others, are held in reverential esteem. The one, "The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach," is the recommendation of the theology of Palestine to Alexandria; the other, "The Wisdom of Solomon," is the recommendation of the theology of Alexandria to Palestine—books furnishing the links which connect the earlier Hebrew literature with that final outburst of religious teaching which is recorded in the Gospels and Epistles.

* Stanley, Jewish Church, vol. iii, lect. xlviii; Westcott, The Bible in the Church; M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia, articles Apocrypha and Canon.

† Says Stanley: "It calls our attention to the fact that there were writings which, though denied a place in the canonical Scriptures, yet glance away from the outskirts of these Scriptures into the Grecian philosophy and poetry, and have been acknowledged by grave theologians, and even by Protestant Churches, (!) to be inspired (?) by the same divine Spirit that breathed, though in fuller tones, through Isaiah or through David." This, though a testimony too enthusiastic to be unbiased, yet has in it more than a kernel of truth. There is certainly no sense in the judgment of absolute rejection of the Apocryphal writings. We need but remind of that affecting passage in the autobiography of John Bunyan, (*Grace Abounding*, pp. 62–65,) where he relates how he was for a long period at once com-

The Wisdom * of Joshua (or, as the Greeks called him, Jesus) the Son of Sirach, B. C. 180, was the first of those writings which, from the sanction given to them by the Church, were called "Ecclesiastical," as distinct from "Canonical," and thus took to itself the name "Ecclesiasticus," which properly belonged to them all. It was for the Jews of Alexandria first, and then for the Christians, "*The Church Book;*" "the favorite book of ecclesiastical edification;" † the "Whole Duty of Man," the "Imitation"—the "summary of all virtues," as it was called in its original title. In some respects it is but a repetition of the ancient writings of Solomon. In some of its maxims it sinks below the dignity of those writings by the homeliness of its details, (Ecclus. viii, 11–19; xi, 10; xiii, 2; xix, 1; xxix; xxxvii, 11,) for guidance of behavior at meals, (Ecclus. xxxi, 16,) of commercial speculations, of social advancement. But its general tone is worthy of that first contact between the two great civilizations of the ancient world, and breathes a spirit which an Isaiah would not have condemned, nor a Sophocles or a Theophrastus have despised. There is not a word in it to countenance the minute casuistries of the later rabbies, or the metaphysical subtleties of the later Alexandrians. It pours out its whole strength in discussing the conduct of human life, or the direction of the soul to noble aims. Here first in the sacred books we find the full delineation of the idea of education—the slow, gradual process, "at first by crooked ways, then will she return the (Ecclus. iv, 17,) straight way, and comfort him, and show him her secrets." "At the last thou shalt find her rest, and that shall be turned to thy joy. Then shall her fetters be a strong defense for thee, and her chains a robe of glory."

forted and perplexed by finding deep inward relief from words for which he vainly sought within the four corners of his Bible: "Look at the generations of old, and see; did ever any trust in the Lord, and was confounded?" "Then I continued," he says, "above a year, and could not find the place; but at last, casting my eyes upon the Apocrypha books, I found it in the tenth verse of the second chapter of Ecclesiasticus. This at first did somewhat daunt me, because it was not in those texts that we call holy or canonical. Yet as this sentence was the sum and substance of many of the promises, it was my duty to take the comfort of it; and I bless God for that word, for it was of good to me. That word doth still oft times shine before my face."

* It is strange that any doubt should have ever arisen on the date of Ecclesiasticus. The comparison of Haggai i, 1; ii, 1; Zech. i, 7; vii, 1; 1 Macc. xiii, 42; xiv, 27, makes it certain that ἐν τῷ ὀγδοῷ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου Βασιλέως in the Prologue can only mean "in the thirty-eighth year of King Euergetes;" and as the first Euergetes only reigned twenty-five years, the date of the translation is thus fixed to the thirty-eighth year of the second Euergetes, B. C. 132. The indication from the mention of Simon in chap. l, 1, is less certain. But the great probability in favor of identifying him with Simon II. agrees with the conclusion to be drawn from the interval between the grandfather who wrote and the grandson who translated, and this would place the original work about B. C. 180.

† A fierce attack upon it, as favoring Arianism, necromancy, and Judaic error, was published by Reynolds in 1666.

Ecclus. vi, 28. Here is a pointed warning against spoiled children: "Cocker thy child, and he shall make thee afraid; play with him, and he will bring thee to heaviness." Ecclus. xxx, 9. Here is the measure of true nobleness: "It is not meet to despise a poor man that hath understanding, neither is it convenient to magnify a sinful man. Great men and judges and potentates shall be honored, yet is there none of them greater than he that feareth the Lord. To the slave that is wise shall they that are free do service, and he that hath knowledge will not grudge when he is reformed." Ecclus. x, 23, 24. Here is the backbone of the honest love of truth: "In nowise speak against the truth, but be abashed of the error of thy ignorance." "Be not ashamed to confess thy faults, nor swim against the stream of conviction." "Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord shall fight for thee." Ecclus. iv, 25. There is a tender compassion which reaches far into the future religion of mankind: "Let it not grieve thee to bow down thine ear to the poor, and give him a friendly answer with gentleness. Be as a father to the fatherless, and instead of a husband to the widow; so shalt thou be as the son of the Most High, and he shall love thee more than thy mother doth." Ecclus. xii, 1. If there is at times the mournful and hopeless view of life and of death (Ecclus. iv, 8, 10) which pervades the earlier "Preacher," yet on the whole the tone is one of vigorous, magnanimous action. He must have been a delightful teacher who could so write of filial affection (Ecclus. iii, 12–15; vii, 28) and of friendship (Ecclus. vi, 14, 15; iv, 10; xii, 8; xix, 13; xxxvii, 2) in all its forms, and so rise above the harshness of his relations with his slaves. Ecclus. iv, 30; vii, 21; x, 25; xxxiii, 24. He must have seen deep into the problems of social life who contrasts as keenly as Bacon or Goethe the judgments of the uneducated many and the highly educated few. Ecclus. xxxviii, 24; xxxix, 11. Yet in the midst of these homely and varied experiences, which belong only to the imitator of the wise King, a voice as of the Prophet and the Psalmist is still heard. Again and again the strain is raised, such as Amos and Isaiah had lifted up, not the less impressive for the quiet soberness with which it is urged. It is the same doctrine of the substitution of the moral duties for the ceremonial. . . . "To depart from unrighteousness is propitiation." Ecclus. iii, 2, 4, 30; v, 5, 6; vii, 9, 10; xxxv, 1–7. And underneath all this there still burns the quiet flame of hope and resignation. "Look at the generations of old, and see; [it is the passage which "shone before the face" of Bunyan,] did ever any trust in the Lord, and was confounded? As his majesty is, so is his mercy." Ecclus. ii, 4–18. Both by example and by definition there is no more exalted description of the true greatness of prayer. Ecclus. xxiii, 1–6; xxxv, 17. But there is yet another characteristic of the Son of Sirach, more peculiarly his own. As the philosophy of the Hebrew Scriptures is contained in the larger part of the book—possibly from older documents—so their poetry finds a voice in the conclusion, which is beyond

question original. It is the song of praise, (Ecclus. xlii, 15–l, 29,) which, beginning with the glories of the creation, breaks forth into that "Hymn of the Forefathers," as it is called in its ancient title, to which there is no parallel in the Old Testament, but of which the catalogue of the worthies of faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews is an obvious imitation. Here and here only is a full expression given to that natural instinct of reverence for the mighty dead which has in these striking words been heard from generation to generation in the festivals of the great benefactors of Christendom, or when the illustrious of the earth are committed to the grave. "Let us now praise famous men, and the fathers that begat us." Ecclus. xliv, 1. "Their bodies (Ecclus. xliv, 14) are buried in peace, but their name liveth for evermore." It begins with the unknown sages of antiquity; it closes with the "Ultimus Judæorum," as it seemed, of his own generation, Simon the Just. Well might the grandson delight to render into Greek for the countrymen of Pindar and Pericles a roll of heroes as noble as were ever commemorated at the Isthmian games or in the Athenian Ceramicus.

The "Wisdom of the Son of Sirach" was followed, at how long an interval we know not, by "The Wisdom of Solomon." As the former book was the expression of a sage at Jerusalem with a tincture of Alexandrian learning, so *the latter book was the expression of an Alexandrian sage, presenting his Grecian ideas under the forms of Jewish history.* We feel with him the oppressive atmosphere of the elaborate Egyptian idolatry. (Wisdom xiii, 2–19; xv, 17–19.) We see through his eyes the ships passing along the Mediterranean waters into the Alexandrian harbor. (Wisdom xiv, 1–6.) We trace the footprint of Aristotle in the enumeration, word by word, of the four great ethical virtues. (Wisdom viii, 7.) We recognize the rhetoric of the Grecian sophists in the Ptolemæan Court. (Wisdom v, 9–12; xi, 17–18.) We are present at the luxurious banquets and lax discussions of the neighboring philosophers of Cyrene. (Wisdom ii, 1–7.) But in the midst of this Gentile scenery there is a voice which speaks with the authority of the ancient prophets to this new world. The book is a signal instance of the custom prevalent in the two countries before the Christian era, both in the Jewish and the Gentile world, of placing modern untried writing under the shelter of some venerable authority. No name appeared for this purpose so weighty as that of the great master of the wisdom of Israel. Solomon is evoked from the dead past to address the rulers of mankind. . . . The conception of "Wisdom" as "the personified idea of the mind in God, in creation—a mirror in which the world and mankind are ever present to him," (Döllinger, Gentile and Jew, ii, 384,) is in part derived from the ancient Solomonian theology; but it is colored by the Platonic doctrine, and lends itself to the wide development opened by the doctrine of "the Word" in Christian theology, and by the doctrine of "Law" in European philosophy. The very phrases, "love and charity," "Holy Spirit," "only be-

gotten," "manifold," "philanthropic," "Providence," "the fatherhood of God," occur here in the Greek Bible, some of them in the Greek language, for the first time, and appear not again till we find them in the New Testament. . . . And in one special quarter of the religious horizon there is a revelation which this unknown author is the first to proclaim with the authority of firm conviction and deep insight, whether to the Gentile or the Jew; namely, the revelation of "the hope full of immortality," "the immortality of righteousness." Wisdom iii, 4; i, 15. In the Psalmists and Prophets there had been bright anticipations of such a hope, inseparable from their unfailing assurance of the power and goodness of the Eternal. But it never took the form of a positive, distinct assertion. In the Grecian world a vast step forward was taken in the Platonic representations of the last teachings of Socrates. At last the seed thus sown by the doctrine of Athenian philosophy fell on the deep soil of a Hebrew faith, and struck root downward to a depth from which it has never since been eradicated, and bore fruit upward, which has sustained the moral life of Christendom to this hour. Nor is it only the force and pathos with which the truth of a future existence is urged, but the grounds on which it is based, that fill the soul and intensity the teaching of this Jewish Phædo. It is founded on those two convictions, which, alike to the most philosophic and the most simple minds, still seem the most cogent—the imperfection of a good man's existence if limited to this present life, and a firm grasp on the divine perfections. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God." "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die; but they are in peace." "He, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time." "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of his own eternity. To know God is perfect righteousness. To know his power is the root of immortality." Wisdom iii, 2; iv, 13; v, 15; xv, 31.—*Stanley.*

No wonder that this singular book has been ascribed to Philo,* of whom we shall presently have more to say, or to that other Jew of Alexandria, † who was "eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures," and in whom Luther saw the author of the mysterious Epistle to the Hebrews. No wonder that Ewald, ‡ with his usual insight, declares that "in the deep glow which, with all its apparent tranquility, streams through its veins, in the nervous energy of its proverbial style, in the depth of its representations, we have a premonition of John, and in the conception of heathenism a preparation for Paul, like a warm rustle of spring ere the time is fully come."

It certainly matters but little whether we determine that both these productions came out two centuries before or close

* Jerome, *Pref. in Lib. Salom.* † Acts xviii, 24. ‡ v, 484.

upon the dawn of the new era. They are in any case the genuine production of Alexandrian Judaism,* of the union of Greek and Hebrew thought. Of course, we would not be understood here as saying that the conflict between these two contending elements had ceased, but, rather, that we have here but too clearly manifest the tendency of these times to conciliate the Greek philosophy, such as it was then, with biblical monotheism, foreshadowing the possible ground on which the two could meet for united action after the cessation of warfare. This is no more than should be expected. It is but reasonable to suppose, ever and anon, that when there is a meeting of two such spiritual powers as Hellenism and Judaism, such as Grecian culture and Jewish religion—when two such spiritual, world-reforming powers come into conflict with each other—that conflict must necessarily result in new formations; something new will always grow out of it, be it by their antagonism or by their spiritual interpenetration; new creations will be evolved, either bearing the character of both, or pre-eminently that of one of them, yet impregnated in a certain measure by that of the other. The conflict between Hellenism and Judaism was principally a spiritual struggle, and its results a radical change in the thought and belief of both Jew and Macedonian.

Ultimately the outcome of this struggle was the formation of what came to be known as *Neoplatonism*,† a philosophy of syncretism, whose elements are partly Oriental (Alexandrian-Jewish, in particular) and partly Hellenic, but whose form is strictly Hellenic, and whose peculiarity of doctrine is that it is distinguished from Plato's own by the *principle of revelation* contained in the new philosophy.

There must have been attempts to accomplish the fusion of Hellenism and Judaism at Alexandria immediately after the completion of the Septuagint. In that Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures there is as yet no evidence of a combination of Jewish theology with Greek philosophemes. But such a combination existed probably in the dogmas of the Therapeutæ, who held certain doctrines and usages in common with the Pythagoreans.‡ It is manifestly effected by, and

§ Munk, *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, ii, 465.

† See the article in M'Clintock and Strong's Encyclopædia.

‡ Ritter, Hist. of Philos., iv, 330, *sq.*; Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, (2d ed.,) iii, b, 86, *sq.*; 368, *sq.*; Nicolas, *Doctrines Religieuses des Juif*, pp. 129, 140.

clearly revealed as a *fait accompli* in the teachings of, the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus, (about 160 B. C.) He is said to have been a Peripatetic, but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings he seems to have been the inventor of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.* His name, however, is known in connection with the theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses through a very ancient translation of the Pentateuch. † Alleging this, Aristobulus, with the facile descent of error, labored to strengthen his cause by deliberate falsifications of Greek literature—sometimes by inventing whole passages, sometimes by interpolating occasional fragments, in which the ancient Gentile poets ‡ should be made to express the elevated sentiments of Hebrew monotheism. He was determined alike to find the Hebrew religion in the Greek philosophy and the Greek philosophy in the Hebrew Scriptures. § In each of these enterprises there was a noble motive but a dangerous method. In the attempt to find the Hebrew truth in the Greek he was fired, as many a devout Jew might well have been fired, with the desire to claim in that glorious literature, now for the first time opening on the Oriental horizon, an affinity with that which was deemed most sacred in the Jewish faith. ‖ It was like the Renaissance of the same literature after the night of the Middle Ages. The Jewish priest, like the mediæval ecclesiastic, was ravished with the beauty of the new vision, and longed to make it his own. But the means ¶ by which he endeavored to cross the gulf which parted them was

> "A fatal and perfidious bark,
> Built in th' eclipse, and rigged with curses dark."

Yet, whatever the services of Aristobulus, or of his contemporaries and immediate successors, in the development of the Judæo-Alexandrian philosophy, or the consequent develop-

* Stanley, iii, 313; Bleek, Introduction to the Old Testament.

† Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, vii, 14; xiii, 12.

‡ Delitzsch, *Gesch. der Jüdischen Poesie*, p. 211, *sq.*

§ Nicolas, p. 129. ‖ Stanley, iii. 310.

¶ See Valckenaer, *Diatribe de Aristobulo*, Lugd. Bat., 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebii, *Præp. Evang.*; Dähne, ii, 73; Vacherot, *Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*, i, 140; Binde, *Aristobuliche Studien*, Glogau, 1869.

ment there of the Neoplatonic, it was the spirited and prolific Jewish theologian, Philo, of Alexandria, the contemporary of the founders of Christianity, who gave to ancient Hellenic thought (Plato) a Hebrew dress, and, by its union in this transformed condition with various Oriental elements of speculation, produced a syncretism, which for several centuries exercised an important influence not only on the Greek and Jewish, but also on the Christian world.*

This Philo (surnamed in Latin Judæus, *i. e.*, the Jew, in Hebrew, פילון היהודי; in Greek, *φίλων* [*ὁ*] *Ἰουδαῖος*)—the greatest of ancient, if not of all, Jewish philosophers—flourished in the first century of the Christian era, and was, therefore, a contemporary of Jesus the Christ, and of several of his apostles. Regarding Philo's personal circumstances we find information in Josephus,† Eusebius,‡ Hieronymus,§ Suidas, Isidorus Pelusiota, Photius.‖ Later writers mention him as Jedediah the Alexandrine.¶ The most reliable informations are occasional notices contained in the Philonic writings, especially in the two works *Legatio ad Caium* and *Contra Flaccum*. According to these Philo was a native, and throughout life a resident, of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A. D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the Emperor Caligula, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Cesar.** He was then probably about

* There can be no doubt that from the earliest efforts of the Church in the formularization of Christian doctrine as a theological system, the philosophy of Plato entered largely into the speculations of patristic divines, furnished them with methods of reasoning against the subtle crochets which, under the name of "heresies," cropped up so abundantly in those inquisitive times, and controlled the solemn definitions which were accepted by common consent as dogmas of the faith. From the position which Philo occupied in the Jewish world we may easily conclude that his works would be among the most influential channels through which this stream of Greek wisdom joined the rising current of Christian theology. See Gfrörer, *Kritische Gesch. des Christenthums*, vol. i; Dahne, *Jüdisch-Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii; Schürer, *Lehrb. der N. T. Zeitgesch.*, 1874, p. 619; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i, 22; Matter, *Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis l'ère Chrétienne*, Paris, 1854.

† Antiquities, xviii, 8, 1; xx, 5, 2.
‡ *Histor. Eccles.*, ii, 4, *sq.*
§ *Vir. Illustr.*
‖ Cod. cv.
¶ Beer, *Jüdische Sekten.*, 1, 97.
** Josephus, Ant., xviii, 8, 1; comp. *De Legat. ad Caium*, xxviii.

sixty years old. If so, he was born about B. C. 20, and was contemporary with all the important events of the New Testament. He went again to Rome in the reign of Claudius, but after this nothing is known with certainty of his whereabouts. Philo had a brother employed in the affairs of government at Alexandria, named Alexander Lysimachus, who is supposed to be the Alexander mentioned in Acts iv, 6, as a man "of the kindred of the high-priest." That Philo was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus,* and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is also reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. In fact, we may suppose that he would himself have claimed the name of a Pharisee by the same test which St. Paul preferred in his own case, "the hope and resurrection of the dead." That he was no Sadducee is abundantly clear from the prominent places which "angels and spirits" occupy in his theological system. Philo was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by contemporary Jews of his social condition† he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world, and the home of revived Hellenism. His learning is very clearly attested, moreover, by the number of Greek writers, especially poets, quoted in his works: Homer, Hesiod, Solon, Theognis, Pindar, Æschylus, Ion, Sophocles, Euripides; the fabulist Æsop; the physician Hippocrates; the historians Thucydides and Xenophon; the geographer Eratosthenes; and the philosophers Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Bias, Pythagoras, Ocellus Lucanus, Hippasus, Philolaus, Empedocles, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno Eleaticus, Heraclitus, Democritus, Anaxarchus, Antisthenes, Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Heraclides, Critolaus, Epicurus, Diogenes, Zeno the Stoic, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Boethius, Panætius, Posidonius.‡

Besides philosophy Philo entirely mastered the whole Alexandrine biblical science. He knew thoroughly all those various explanations of the Bible, especially of the law, some al-

* Ant., xviii, 8, 1. † Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, viii, 13. ‡ Hersfeld, ii, 465.

legorical, some strictly literal, which were in vogue at his time among the Jews, for he often quotes, criticises, or approves them. It is, therefore, most absurd for Scaliger or Cudworth to assert that he was ignorant of Jewish literature and customs; and Fabricius and Mangey have most clearly shown that such a view is entirely groundless. The supposition of his ignorance of Hebrew must have arisen from the fact that the Jews of Alexandria at this time were so little acquainted with the original of the Old Testament Scriptures that they had to be supplied with the Septuagint and other Greek versions. But even Geiger, who says that Philo had but a schoolboy knowledge of the Hebrew language, concedes that when the translation of the Bible was undertaken for the Alexandrian Jews "they had not yet been altogether estranged from the Hebrew language." As absurd as is this charge of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew is the charge that Philo's Greek is unclassical, and this because he was a Jew. As well might we say of the Jewish *literati* of Germany that their style is Jewish-German, and not the pure tongue of Lessing and Gervinus. Philo's Greek was, of course, not that of Plato, nor the pure Attic of Demosthenes. No one at Alexandria wrote so purely, but Philo wrote as did his contemporaries, and as wrote the best of them. In his treatise *De Congressu*, xiv, Philo refers himself to his own attainments in grammar, philosophy, geometry, music, and poetry; and his accomplished and beautiful character was thus gracefully attested by his wife, who, when once asked why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, replied, "The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife." *

The circumstance that Philo was contemporary with New Testament events, coupled with his high intelligence and interest in sacred learning, as well as with the fact that he once visited Jerusalem "to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the temple," (although only one such visit is referred to,† his piety and devotion probably prompted occasional repetitions of this pilgrimage, which were less likely to be mentioned because of his modesty and reserve in personal matters,) led ancient writers to connect Philo intimately with Christianity.

* *Fragments*, ed. Richter, vi, 236.

† Richter's ed. of *Fragments*, vi, 200.

Photius * makes him a friend of the Apostle Peter; as do also Eusebius,† Jerome,‡ and Suidas. Photius goes so far as to say that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church, but afterward fell from it. While we have no direct means of testing the truth of such statements, they certainly do not bear evidence on their face. A man of such decided characteristics as Philo could no more have remained quiet after conversion than did Saul of Tarsus, and, because we have no utterances from him as a Christian, we have reason to reject the story as fabulous from first to last. Besides, Philo's own extant writings do not give the slightest reference to any such important step, and this fact tells even more strongly, if possible, against the report.

We are not quite so sure ourselves that Simon Peter was ever at Rome, and it is, therefore, a grave question in our mind whether Philo in his probably oft repeated visits to the eternal city ever could have encountered this leader of the personal disciples of Christ and special apostle to the Jews. But it would be curious to speculate, if we could venture to do so, on the talk that might be imagined to pass between the princely diplomatist of Alexandria and the boatman of the Galilean lake. For the main object of Philo's life, as we gather from many recondite treatises which he has left behind him, was to build up on the old Jewish faith a religious system which should meet the spiritual wants of all mankind. With such speculations working in his mind, it might well be supposed that he would have taken great interest in the story of the carpenter's Son of Nazareth, and the Gospel which he had committed to his followers for proclamation throughout the whole world—an interest, we may assume, of a somewhat patronizing and supercilious sort. For Simon Peter might be supposed to tell how the Gospel of which he talked was to be "preached to the poor," whereas Philo was intent on a reconciliation between Jewish theology and the demand for a practical religion preferred on behalf of abstract reasoners and students of deep philosophy—the broad-browed thinkers who mustered under the Painted Porch of Athens, or held high disputations in the groves of the Lyceum. It is curious, too, to trace the several fates of the popular and philosophical

* *Bibl. Cod.*, xv. † *Hist. Eccles.*, ii, 17. ‡ *Catal. Script. Eccles.*

movements, as associated with the two contemporaries, even if they never came into contact with each other. In these our modern days, the writings sent out by the "Fisherman of Galilee" hold their potency in the realms of the Cesars, and far beyond, in countries unknown to them; and day by day the territory enlarges, and fast hastens the hour when the whole world shall own them, revere their author, and bless that kind Providence which inspired such teachings. But how about the writings which Philo has left behind? How many are there who, in the course of every year, care to brush the dust from his volumes as they rest in some old-world college library, or to find out for themselves how he proposed to deal with the great problems which were offering themselves for solution about the opening of the Christian era? Nevertheless, the thought and inquiry which Philo represented had a very important influence on the early history of Christianity; and, if only for the sake of the man's own eloquence and earnestness, it will well repay the inquirer of the history of intellectual development to ascertain the worth and honesty of those efforts which this noble Jew made to furnish a form of religion to his fellowmen, at one of the most, if not the most, critical period in the history of human thought.

---

## Art. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

American Catholic Quarterly Review, October, 1877. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Nuncio and the Two Vicars Apostolic: Adda, Leyburn, and Giffard. 2. Positivism and Evolutionism. 3. A Catholic Poet of the Seventeenth Century. 4. Professor Huxley on Evolution. 5. Hunting Sitting Bull. 6. The Relations of the Church and the Constitution of the United States. 7. Syriac Grammars.

Baptist Quarterly, October, 1877. (Philadelphia.)—1. Cyprian. 2. Baptist Succession. 3. Time of the Second Advent. 4. George Fox and the Early Friends. 5. Philosophy without Assumptions. 6. Baptism and Remission. 7. Scope of Effective Sunday-School Instruction.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, October, 1877. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Of Repentance. 2. The Laic Priesthood. 3. Misdevelopment of the Lutheran Church in America. 4. Rev. David F. Bittle, D.D. 5. What We are to Live on. 6. The Nature of Language. 7. Thesis on the Galesburgh Rule.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1877. (Boston.)—1. Three Races, Three Empires, and Three Religions. 2. Creation De Nihilo. 3. Judas Iscariot, the Apostate: His Sin, Repentance, and Death. 4. Force not the Equivalent of Personality. 5. Cushite Origin of the Sacred Writing, Language, and Literature of Babylon. 6. Sir James Edward Smith.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1877. (Andover.)—1. The Difficulties of the Concept of God. 2. Atonement. 3. The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament. 4. President Finney's System of Theology in its Relations to the So-called New England Theology. 5. Identification of Succoth and Penuel. 6. Note on Genesis xi, 26. 7. Is Παρθένος the Correct Rendering of עלמה in Isaiah vii, 14? 8. The Theological Journals of Germany.

In the third article Dr. M'Ilvaine, who takes pains to avow his full faith in the inspiration of the Old Testament as well as of the New, undertakes to solve some of the problems which have troubled many thoughtful students of the Scriptures, who have committed the mistake of examining institutions and events of a darker age by the light of Christianity and the nineteenth century. We will let him state for himself the principle laid down:—

The moral and spiritual light of the New Testament is superior to that of the Old; in other words, the revelations of the old dispensation were not complete or final, but partial, in great part provisional, and necessarily accommodated to the low intellectual, moral, and spiritual condition of the people to whom they were originally communicated. . . . It is certain from all human experience, that truths, ideas, and even rules of moral conduct, which present no difficulty to people of developed and cultivated faculties, cannot be received, nor even comprehended, by those who are in comparatively a low state of intellectual culture, moral sensibility, and spiritual enlightenment, such as, beyond a question, was that of the Israelites in the time of Moses. For they were a vast horde of emancipated slaves, just escaped from centuries of degrading and corrupting bondage, among a people wholly given to the grossest idolatries and superstitions. Consequently they were incapable of receiving those high and pure and spiritual revelations of God and divine things which we have in the New Testament. These would have made no impression upon their unsusceptible moral and spiritual faculties—upon what Christ called the hardness of their hearts; for which reason, as he explained to the Pharisees, they were accommodated by Moses, in one case at least, with an inferior rule of moral conduct—a significant case which will come up hereafter. A national education of fifteen hundred years in the doctrines of the unity of God, and of the expiation of guilt by a sin-bearer, as well as in many other things, was indispensable to prepare them for the reception of the Gospel as revealed by Christ and his apostles. The proof of this is, that God actually subjected them to such a course of training and preparation under their ritual and moral laws, the ministry of their prophets, and

the discipline of their wonderful providential history. And thus, in the fullness of time, they were actually prepared for the superior light of the new dispensation.—Pp. 675, 676.

Having been placed under the educating discipline of the Mosaic law, it was evidently deemed indispensable to the great end sought, that the Hebrew people should be completely separated from all other nations; and this procedure must carry with it all its necessary consequences. Among them was the command to exterminate the previous inhabitants of the land, on which we have the following:—

Now the difficulty here is not whether it was right thus to destroy, root and branch, a people whose cup of iniquity was full. Of this there can be no question with any who believe in the providence of God. For it was under his providential government that these nations, like Sodom and Gomorrah, Pompeii and Herculaneum, were actually destroyed. But the difficulty is this: how the giving of such commands to his moral creatures—how his requiring of them to slay without pity such multitudes of their fellow-creatures, including, of necessity, the aged and infirm, parents and children, infants at the breast, nursing mothers, women with child, and in their travail sorrows—how all this is to be reconciled with the character of God, the teaching of Christ, and, especially, with his law of love to enemies, and pity for the feeble and suffering. We do not write for those, if any such there be, who cannot feel that there is any difficulty here.

It may not, indeed, be possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give a solution of this difficulty which shall be perfectly satisfactory. For we are surrounded by mysteries in the providence of God—undeniable facts—which no created mind can fathom. But it is essential to the account here given us, that the agency of the children of Israel in this destruction of the Canaanites should be regarded as a solemn judicial act, in execution of the judgment of God upon a people whose moral corruptions were such that their continued existence upon the earth could be no longer tolerated; whose extermination, moreover, was indispensable in order that the covenant people might be effectually separated from their corrupting influence; in other words, that the whole object for which Israel had been called out of the world, and consecrated to the work of making the necessary preparation for the coming of Christ and the blessings of the Gospel, might not be frustrated. Hence its justification is placed upon this ground by God himself in the words, "Thou shalt consume all the people. . . . They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee to sin against me; for if thou serve their gods it will surely be a snare unto thee." And so it proved, wherever they failed to obey these commands, in all their subsequent history. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the highest and most spiritual

laws of morality had not yet been revealed, nor could be, as is proved by the fact, until the time should come when the necessity for this outward separation of the people from other nations should cease. The commands which were given to them upon this subject, as upon all others, had to be accommodated to the degree of moral light which they were capable of receiving, and they could not go beyond it. Hence this whole transaction must be regarded as belonging to a lower moral condition than that for which it was intended to prepare, though, doubtless, to the highest which it was possible in consistency with the necessity of thus keeping the covenant people sequestered from the influence of the heathen.—Pp. 686, 687.

As illustrative of the abrogation by our Lord of allowances of the law of Moses in accommodation to the moral capacities of the people, we may take the case of

DIVORCE.

Christ, by his own authority, totally abrogates that freedom of divorce which had been previously allowed. For we find nothing in the law to restrain any man from putting away his wife, or wives, at his own pleasure, nor from marrying other women, nor women so divorced from marrying other men. On the contrary, all these customs were tolerated in the following prescribed form: "When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand, and send her out of his house; and when she is departed, she may go and be another man's wife." And, from the manner in which such divorces are referred to by the later prophets, as also our knowledge of human nature, we may be sure that they ultimately became very common, and an evil of enormous magnitude. . . . But the great reason why this freedom was tolerated must have been that which our Lord himself gives, in this passage, where he abrogates it in the most unequivocal manner: "It was said, Whosoever will put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is [so] divorced committeth adultery." Now, when the Pharisees objected to this doctrine on the ground that Moses had authorized them thus to repudiate their wives, he admits the fact as undeniable, and assigns as a reason for this toleration the hardness of their hearts, which rendered them incapable of receiving any better or more perfect rule of moral conduct. At the same time he reiterates his own prohibition of what Moses had allowed, and on the ground that it was not in accordance with the eternal laws of morality—"from the beginning it was not so"—and affirms on his own authority, as before, that if they should continue to practice it they would incur the guilt of adultery:

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is [so] put away doth commit adultery."—Pp. 702–704.

North American Review, November, 1877. (Boston.) 1. Resumption of Specie Payments. 2. Cavalier de la Salle. 3. The War in the East. 4. The Functions of Unbelief. 5. The Southern Question. 6. Michelangelo and the Buonarroti Archives. 7. America in Africa, Part II. 8. The Situation in France. 9. How shall the Nation Regain Prosperity? Part III. 10. The Ultramontane Movement in Canada.

In the article on "The Southern Question," one of the ablest in this brilliant number, Mr. Charles Gayarré, a Louisianian, vividly describes the terribleness of the whirlwind reaped in the last few years by those who for two centuries sowed the wind, and, no doubt, correctly, the feelings which prevail among the whites of the South, with the purpose on his part of enlightening the North and West respecting them. The problem requiring solution is this: How shall the freedmen live in harmony with their former masters? or, more explicitly, since this is made to turn on the question of race, How shall the free negro and the Caucasian live peacefully together on the same soil?

The fundamental mistake of our Southern brethren after the war was in such treatment of the freedmen as made the gift of the ballot by a constitutional amendment the necessary security of their freedom. It is confessedly a perilous power in the hands of ignorant men. The greatest danger to the Republic is in its million and a half entitled to vote and unable to read; and of these seventy per cent. is in the Southern States. But, be it remembered, also, that the very people who proposed to save the freedman by the ballot have freely poured millions of money into the South in efforts to educate him for his new

responsibilities, and thus avert the danger; and, notwithstanding the barbarous burning of school-houses and expulsion of teachers, it has been continued to this hour. Their second mistake was in the omission to accept the situation and do what they now propose, namely, to influence the negro vote by superior intelligence and persuasion. A large amount of the mischief and misrule of later days might thus have been prevented, and the question of race avoided. The claim of office on the ground of race or nationality is always bad, in State or Church. The color line, regardless of intelligence or capacity, is the worst possible line. But, asks our author, "Suppose our negroes were transported to Massachusetts, and composed half of the population of that Commonwealth, would the sons of the sturdy old Puritans melt into such tender philanthropy as to permit those negroes to occupy half of the offices of that State, and claim one of the two Senators and half of the Representatives in Congress?" Assuredly, no: Massachusetts would give nothing *because* of color, while her sons would both use the ballot and respect its decisions. In the case supposed, that venerable Commonwealth, which expends for education about sixteen dollars per annum to every person of school age, while Georgia expends forty-five cents, would at once multiply her school-houses, and compel the attendance at school of every child of from five to sixteen years of age; she would probably require ability to read as a condition of suffrage; she would certainly demand, as now, the pre-payment of the poll-tax of two dollars; and she would protect the voter at the ballot-box against all comers. The last thing she would do would be to threaten to kill off the negroes that white men might rule. The true solution of the Southern question is—*the school-house.* It is, indeed, conceded that white and black should have "equal opportunity for education," but the value of the concession depends on the amount given. Let Georgia expend eleven dollars per scholar, as does Ohio, instead of forty-five cents, and let South Carolina substitute the eight dollars of Illinois for her own forty cents, and the school system of the South will inaugurate a new civilization.

THE SOUTHERN REVIEW, October. 1877. (Baltimore)—1. Education: The Study of Mathematics. 2. Fashion in Funerals and Graveyards. 3. The Two Genealogies of Christ. 4. The Bell. 5. Edwards on the Will. 6. The Gospel according to St. John. 7. The Microscope in Common Life. 8. Arminian Inconsistencies and Errors.

Doctor Bledsoe is justly indignant at the renewal of the old attempt to stigmatize Methodists as Pelagians. He pronounces it "a disgrace to the theological literature of the South," and he might have added, to its intelligence as well. "It is simply a calumny," he says, "in which no Christian man or gentleman ought to indulge." Is there in all the South no Moses Stuart to tell his brethren, as did he of Andover a few years since, that they are guilty of slander?

The Calvinistic dogma of the guilt of original sin, and its pedigree, are thus treated:—

Viewed in the light of reason, the dogma that what we bring into the world with us, as the sad inheritance of Adam's sin and self-corruption, is our own proper and personal sin, for which we deserve eternal "wrath and damnation," appeared to us to be inconceivably monstrous. This inherited evil was our misfortune, and not our fault; it was a depravity of our nature, and not a sin; but *in itself it is not sin.* That is, it leads to all sin, as temptation leads the will, but not as an efficient cause produces its effect. Otherwise the will would not be free in sinning, or responsible for its sinful acts.

When we came, in the light of history, to trace this Calvinistic dogma to its source, its existence ceased to surprise us. We saw, in the first place, that during the first four centuries of the Church all the fathers held the doctrine of natural depravity as above stated. They called it, with one voice, the "disease," the "disorder," the "depravity," or the "corruption," of our nature; but they denied that it was sin, or was deserving of punishment. As late as the year A. D. 253 it was denied by the council of sixty-six bishops, with Cyprian at their head, that infants had any sin of their own; and yet they decided that infants, dying unbaptized, would be lost. Lost for what? Lost, and lost forever, because their parents neglected to have them baptized? And could the "priest" save them from hell, from "God's wrath and damnation," by sprinkling them with a little holy water? These questions, grave as they were, and awful, seemed not to have been seriously considered for nearly a century and a half after this council of 253. It was in the beginning of the fifth century that the genius of Pelagius was aroused and called into active hostility by the monstrous dogma of the damnation of unbaptized infants who die in infancy. This brought him into collision with Augustine. "Lost for what?" said he. "Lost merely because they were not baptized?" "No," an-

swered Augustine, after much hesitation, wavering, and uncertainty, "Not lost merely because they were not baptized, but because the *guilt* of 'original sin' justly exposed them to 'God's wrath and damnation.'". Both disputants became heretics in the course of the controversy; that is, both departed from all the former teaching of the Church. Pelagius did so by denying that the posterity of Adam received any harm or hurt in consequence of his sin, and Augustine, by asserting that the depraved nature inherited by us is truly and properly sin, which deserves "the fire prepared for the devil and his angels." We have shown in the first article of this Review, for July, 1877, how and by what means the heresy of Augustine put down and crushed the heresy of Pelagius.

The great reformer Luther, the Augustinian monk, brought the heresy of Augustine out of the Church of Rome with him, and it was embodied in the second article of the Augsburg Confession. The reformers of the Church of England, as the Bishop of Ely has truly said, derived from that article of the Augsburg Confession the dogma that "original sin," in every one that is born into the world, "deserveth God's wrath and damnation;" and in these awful words, incorporated it into her "Ninth Article."—Pp. 473–475.

But, as is afterward shown, Mr. Wesley, in framing the Articles for his Methodist Episcopal Church, struck out this whole Calvinistic clause.

NOTE.—Since writing the above we have received news of the decease of the able editor. His Quarterly will be continued at any rate to the close of the year 1878.

---

## *English Reviews.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1877. (London.)—1. The Consensus of the Reformed Confessions. 2. The Testimony of Paul to Christianity, according to the Tubingen School. 3. Church Life in the Nineteenth Century—Geneva and Scotland. 4. On the Revision of the Westminster Confession. 5. Incarnation and Resurrection: the Essentials of Christianity. 6. The Place of the Psalms in Modern Apologetic. 7. The Early Celtic Church: Its Doctrines and Constitution Examined and Compared with those of the Contemporary Catholic Church. 8. The Study of the Old Testament in 1876.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (London.)—1. King René of Anjou. 2. The Sects of the Commonwealth. 3. Jules Michelet. 4. George Buchanan. 5. Thomas De Quincey. 6. The Greek Revolution. 7. The Social Question in Sicily.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Memoirs of Odilon-Barrot. 2. History of the Mongols. 3. Cæsarism, Romanism, Socialism: the Three Extreme Ideals. 4. Carriages, Roads, and Coaches. 5. Contemporary Italian Poets. 6. The Lobster, Crab, and Oyster Fisheries. 7. Alfred Austin's Poems. 8. The New Republic and Modern Philosophers. 9. Ordination and Confession. 10. The Liberal Party and Foreign Politics.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1877. (London.)—1. Memoir of Charles Kingsley. 2. Thomas De Quincey. 3. Scottish Ecclesiastical Biographies. 4. Calvin and Servetus. 5. Mohammedanism. 6. The Wesleyan Methodist Atlas. 7. Naville's Julian the Apostate and Polytheism.

That Calvin was mainly responsible for the burning of Servetus is the long-since recorded judgment of history. The ugly fact remains a dark blot on the fame of the great reformer, whatever explanation of it we may adopt. Let us, if possible, acquit him of personal malice, though it is not easy to do so in view of his letter to Favel, then pastor at Neuchatel, referring to annotations made by Servetus upon a copy of the Institutes lent him by Calvin. "Servetus wrote to me lately," he says, "and, beside his letter, sent me a volume full of his ravings, telling me with audacious arrogance that I should there find things stupendous and unheard of until now. He offers to come here if I approve; but I will not pledge my faith to him; for did he come, if I have any authority here, I should never suffer him to go away alive." Calvin believed in and defended the right of the civil magistrate to punish heresy, holding still the lesson of intolerance taught him in his training for the Romish priesthood.

Of Servetus the world has known little. Dr. Willis, a physician, has given the public the fullest account of him ever written, having had his attention called to him as a practitioner of medicine near Lyons, and especially to a chapter in one of his works, treating of the circulation of the blood through the lungs, and anticipating in some respects the discovery of Harvey. Servetus was born in Arragon, and educated at the University of Saragossa. Like Calvin, he was intended for the Church, but after a time renounced his purpose and studied law. Associated in some capacity with the emperor's confessor, perhaps as private secretary, he was present at the coronation of Charles V., and at the Diet of Augsburg. His first work, *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, was published in Switzerland; but, notwithstanding the liberality of the Swiss reformers, with whom he had formed an acquaintance, he was compelled to seek safety in Paris, where he connected himself with the university, taking the name of Villeneuve, from the place of his birth. There, not long afterward, he met Calvin and discussed with him the doctrines of his book. We next find him at Lyons reading for a publishing house, and editing Ptolemy's

Geography, supplementing it with ample notes, among which was the unfortunate statement that Judea was not then a land flowing with milk and honey. Here, also, he studied medicine. Returning to Paris, he won the reputation of "a man most illustrious in every class of letters, and scarcely second to any in the science of Galen."

Thirteen years thus elapsed after the meeting with Calvin, when Servetus began a correspondence with him, professedly making inquiries for the truth in some matters of theology. Ere long, however, he assumed the tone of a critic, and outraged Calvin by his want of deference and his unorthodoxy. This was followed by the letter to Favel, the original of which, in Calvin's own handwriting, is still in the Paris Library. But the great offense of Servetus was in his *Christianismi Restitutio*, printed secretly, a copy of which was sent to Calvin in confidence. As this book was the cause of all his woes, let us see what the doctrines were for which he lost his life :—

They are a strange mixture of the experimental doctrines of Christianity with theosophic reasonings which make them utterly void. In dealing with the former he speaks of faith as "the first element, an emotion rather than a recognition, a spontaneous movement of the heart, not an act of the understanding, its essence being belief in the man Jesus Christ as being the Son of God." Its effects are described in terms identical with those which would be employed by any evangelical divine of the present day. He makes but little of the Fall. Yet he admits the efficacy of Redemption, only it is regarded, in accordance with a theory of an earlier age, as designed not to satisfy divine justice, but to "traverse the devil in the rights he had acquired by guile." Men will not, however, be condemned for Adam's sin, but only for their own. The finally impenitent will be annihilated. . . . In reference to God and the creation he says that the world is "a manifestation and communication of God in time and space, manifestation taking place through the word, communication through the agency called Spirit." All existence as derived from God is to be accounted divine, although in diverse degrees. An archetypal universe existed before the actual world came into being, and this is the Logos, a virtual and potential Son, but not an actual co-eternal Son. The Son first acquired form and substance in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and was made participant of the Spirit when he began to breathe. The Spirit, however, is but an abstraction. And Christ is the Demiurgos, who created the world. He is truly the Son of the eternal God, being engendered by the Father of the Virgin Mary,

but not the eternal Son of God for the same reason. The distinctions of the Trinity are purely formal. God is essentially in all things, and all things essentially in God.—Pp. 112, 113.

Calvin was himself too great a heretic to be listened to on a charge of heresy by the Roman Catholic authorities of Vienne, but he could reach the same result by indirection. He persuaded a young man at Geneva to write to a relative at Lyons, and furnished from the book the evidence to be laid before the clerical authorities, taking care to keep himself in the background. Servetus was arrested on this information and tried, but managed to escape before sentence, with the connivance, it is believed, of some of his judges. He was condemned in his absence to the flames, but, as he had fled, his effigy was burned, as was also his book. He betook himself to Switzerland, and after some months of wandering, came to Geneva. He did not intend to stay, and yet he most strangely remained. A month elapsed before Calvin gained knowledge of his presence there, but on learning it he promptly denounced him, and caused his arrest. It was his hand that within twenty-four hours drew up the bill of thirty-eight charges, founding them on the *Christianismi Restitutio*, though La Fontaine was put forward as the formal accuser. These charges mostly referred to the theological opinions of Servetus, yet one was of defaming Calvin and the Church of Geneva. Whether on coming to Geneva he allied himself with the popular party that was then struggling with Calvin for power, and seeking to expel him a second time from the city, does not appear; certain it is that the Libertines, as they were called, espoused his cause and rallied to his defense, doubtless in the hope of using him to gain their own ends; and with equal facility they dropped him when they saw that they were on the losing side.

A probable case having been made out, the affair came into the hands of the Attorney General, who framed a fresh indictment, and pressed the trial forward, Calvin taking an important part in the proceedings. He even brought up the passage about Judea, and insisted that "whoever asserted that Judea did not flow with milk and honey sinned against the Holy Ghost." The prisoner's cross-examination continued for a fortnight, and included not only his theological speculations, but such irrelevant matters as the way of his escape from

Vienne, and his reasons for never having married. No evil was proved upon him except his heresies. At the request of the Council, the pastors tried to bring him to a recantation, but in vain. Calvin then prepared a new bill of thirty-eight charges. Some time was spent in the hearing, when the cantons were consulted, Servetus, perhaps, originating the proposal under the advice of the Libertines. But while awaiting their answers Calvin wrote to a friend, "I hope for a capital sentence at all events;" and he was gratified.

It would seem as if Servetus apprehended small danger from the present proceeding, if we may judge by his attitude toward Calvin in the interval. He boldly arraigns him on four "great and notable" charges, taxes him with the instigation of the Vienne trial, and demands in virtue of the *lex talionis* that he shall be sent to prison till the cause is decided between them. Still, at times he seems to have had forebodings, for we find him in a letter to a friend speaking in terms that clearly point to the dreadful issue. During the present interval also a demand was made by the Roman Catholic tribunal at Vienne that the prisoner should be given up to its tender mercies. Servetus was offered the choice between returning to Vienne and awaiting the result of the appeal to the States. He preferred the latter alternative. The former he knew would be certain death, since public attention had been fixed upon his errors.

And now the answers of the four councils and the four consistories came. With a unanimity which does not say much for their realization of the true nature of that religious liberty whose foremost exponents they ought to have been, these four bands of Christian pastors and these four companies of Christian laymen gave their sentence for death. . . . Any scruples that may have been felt to an extreme course were now at an end. The express sanction of the four cantons had been given to it, and to this was added the moral influence of the thoroughly aroused Romanist authorities at Vienne. . . . The following resolution was carried by a majority of votes: "Having a summary of the process against the prisoner, Michael Servetus, and the reports of the parties consulted before us, it is hereby resolved, and, in consideration of his great errors and blasphemies, decreed, that he be taken to Champnel, and there burned alive; that this sentence be carried into effect on the morrow, and that his books be burned with him."

The news fell like a thunder-clap on Servetus's ear. "Only imparted to him in the early morning of the day on which he was doomed to die, he was at first as if struck dumb by the intelligence. He did but groan aloud and sigh as if his heart would burst; and when he recovered speech at length, it was only to rave like one demented, to strike his breast, and cry in

his native speech, '*Misericordia! misericordia!*' By degrees, however, he recovered his self-possession and became calm." Some have contrasted this outburst with the calmness of the orthodox martyrs, as intimating that his principles failed to support him in the hour of trial. But it was only a momentary agitation, arising from the suddenness of the blow that dashed all earthly hopes. His constancy after this did not fail. He requested an interview with Calvin, and "desired to ask his pardon." There was no word of recantation on his lips: the faults he wished to confess to Calvin were those of heated speech, and no doubt of deep-rooted enmity. Calvin replied that he had not prosecuted him on personal grounds, and strove, but in vain, to convince him of his errors. . . . Whatever errors there may have been either in doctrine or practice, no one can refuse to Servetus the praise of having met his fate with heroic courage. He died by fire on October 27, 1553, exclaiming with his last breath, "Jesu, thou Son of the eternal God, have compassion on me!"

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Torpedo Warfare. 2. The Philosopher Choo-Foo-Tsze. 3. Souvenirs of Countess d'Agoult. 4. Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths. 5. Prince Hardenberg's Memoirs. 6. The Order of the Coif. 7. Mr. Anthony Trollope's Novels. 8. Lyte's Eton College. 9. The Story of an Indian Life. 10. The Russian Invasion of Turkey.

Ulfilas translated the Scriptures into Gothic, the language of Alaric and Theodoric, having first invented its alphabet, about the middle of the fourth century. The Codex Argenteus, in the University of Upsal, and a few palimpsests in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, are all that remain. The philological student will be pleased to observe the identity in essence of the language with our own, and the explanation afforded of some of our dialectical peculiarities.

Take the complaint of the Jews, in John vi, 60: *Hardu ist thata waurd: whas mag this hausjan?* It only needs, as to the last word, that we should be reminded of the interchangeableness of *s* and *r*, and that we should further compare the German *hören*, (to hear,) and the sentence will at once read off into English: "Hard is that word; what (man) may hear this?"

Again, when we find in the 15th chapter of John that *fijan* = "to love," and that *jus frijonds meinai sijuth* = "you are my friends," (that is, they who love me;) and when we further find that *fijan* = "to hate," and the participle *fijonds* = "one who hates, an enemy;" we then at once perceive how it has come to pass that *friend* and *fiend*, so like in form, have such different meanings; though it is true that the difficulty still remains, to understand how our Teutonic ancestors could allow that one little letter *r* to bridge over the vast gulf between loving and hating. From *fiend* to *ogre*, however, is an easier transition; and when we find in Luke i, 30, as part of the angelic salutation, *Ni*

*ogs thus Mariam*, "*Fear* not, thou, Mary," we at once understand that an ogre was originally any thing that causes fear.

With this word *fijan* for a clue, we can now thread our way through a longer verse, the 26th of the 14th chapter of Luke. *Jabai whas gaggith* (pronounce the double *g* as *ng*) *du mis jah ni fijaith attan seinana jah aiththein, jah quen, jah barna, jah brothruns, jah svistruns, nauhuth-than seina silbins saivala, ni mag meins siponeis visan.* "If who" (= any one) "gangs to me, and hates not his father and mother," (in the Gothic equivalents of these words we have an extraordinary deviation from a very wide-spread type,) "and his wife," (the Gothic for woman has risen into *queen* by a converse process to that by which the Italian *donna* has descended into woman,) "and his bairns, and his brothers and his sisters, and still then" (nauh = German noch) "his self's soul," (compare the Scotch *sawl* and the German *seele*,) "he may not be my disciple."

We spoke of the study of our own dialects, as being illustrated by the labors of Ulfilas. In the northern, and, we believe, in some of the eastern counties of England, the word to *wilt* is used of the decay of fruit, (as, "these pears have wilted;") and this dialectical word, like so many others, is retained in the American vocabulary, though in a rather different sense. Thus, in describing an action in the American Civil War, a journalist wrote, "Our troops wilted," (ran away.) This word is accounted for by the Gothic *ga-swiltan*, to die. Again, the Yorkshire *mickle* and the Scotch *meikle* correspond to *mikils*, the regular Gothic equivalent of great. The Scotch *sib* (of kin to) is represented by the Gothic *sibja*, (relationship.) When a north-countryman says, "*I'm ganging to my bairns*," he speaks, as the texts above quoted show us, almost pure Gothic. We may have been sometimes puzzled to know why Londoners now talk of *shop-lifting*, and why the Scotch borderers used to talk of *cattle-lifting*. But when we read the beautiful Gothic translation of the tenth chapter of John, we see at once that "to lift," in the sense of "to rob," is a rightful Teutonic word. *Saei inn ni atgaggith thairh daur in gardan lambe ak steigith aljathro*, ("He that goes not in through the door into the yard of the lambs, but mounts another way,") "*sah hliftus ist jah vaidedja*," ("he is a thief and an evildoer.")—Page 191.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Hindu Society and English Rule. 2. Torpedo Warfare. 3. Renaissance in Italy. 4. The Supernatural Element in Shakspeare. 5. Sir John Bowring. 6. Pre-Christian Dispensaries and Hospitals. 7. Russian Literature. 8. Cross-Fertilization of Plants, and Consanguineous Marriage.

We find in a book notice an interesting statement of the results of recent European investigations respecting idiocy and imbecility:

Of the causes of idiocy, that which stands out in the most terrible prominence is its hereditary reproduction. Of all mental derangements, it is that which is most frequently propagated by de-

scent. In about one half of the cases inherited neurotic tendency may be traced, sometimes showing itself as some other form of nerve disease. Idiocy may beget idiocy, as in the diabolical experiment recorded of some parish authorities, who, in order to get rid of the expense of maintaining a female idiot, hired a male idiot of a neighboring parish to marry her, by which the latter parish had to maintain the two, and also three idiot children which resulted from the union. The variation in the diseases resulting from hereditary taint, the manner in which generations and individuals may escape and yet transmit the tendency, is one of the strangest phenomena of heredity. Something more than the inherited taint is evidently necessary for the production of idiocy, and these exciting causes may produce it when no inherited taint exists. Dr. Ireland attributes considerable influence to profound mental emotions affecting the mother during pregnancy, and quotes evidence to show that the exciting and anxious male occupations into which women are now rushing and are being led, increase the proportion of idiots in their offspring, and may probably prove a widely effective cause of degeneracy of race. A careful survey of the evidence relating to marriages of consanguinity indisposes him to attribute much influence to it, except as intensifying hereditary taint. . . . It is one of the brighter lights on this dark subject to learn how much may be and has been done in the education of idiots. This country was long behind France and America in the attempt, but our institutions, thanks mainly to private benevolence, are now among the best. That the task is one of great difficulty it is hardly necessary to say. It must be both physical and mental, and succeeds far better as carried on in institutions than in private life. It should, if possible, begin early, but the period between the twelfth and fifteenth years is that in which most can be done. Cleanliness has first to be taught, and then the simple properties of objects. Speech may be taught to a large proportion, and many who cannot be taught to speak may be educated to express themselves in signs. The education of the senses has to proceed on a regular method. A few imbeciles can be taught to read, but the difficulties in the task, occasioned by the unsystematic character of English spelling, are great; and Dr. Ireland mentions an instance of an imbecile girl who had learned to read, saying to him, as if a bright idea had just struck her, "You sometimes can know to say a word from the way it is spelt."

## *Indian Reviews.*

Indian Evangelical Review, July, 1877. (Bombay.) 1. Theology of Christ. 2. The Native Christians of Salsette. 3. Sabbath Observance. 4. The Church and the Bible. 5. Sahet Mahet. 6. Principles of Spiritual Sowing.

The full title of this Review, which commences with the present number its fifth volume, is "The Indian Evangelical Re-

view; a Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort." It is the first that we have received, and we are greatly pleased with its examination. Its pages exhibit a rare ability, and a richly evangelical and catholic spirit. The leading article, a review of Dr. J. P. Thompson's volume with the same title, exhibits a breadth of thought and scholarship that might both satisfy and grace the proudest Review of any land. The second article is an account of a body of Christians in the neighborhood of Bombay, descendants of the converts of Xavier. The fifth article is devoted to the ruins of Sahet Mahet, the ancient Sravasti, the metropolis of Buddhism, in North India, and, in the belief that rich archæological treasures may be exhumed, pleads for complete explorations under Government auspices. In the sixth, a paper full of missionary fire, is a paragraph that we do well to heed:—

> In no country, probably, so much as in India, and among no people so much as the Hindus, does the danger exist of building up within the Church wood, hay, stubble, and other perishable materials, which will be utterly consumed when the Lord's fire comes to try every missionary's work. The danger is all the greater when the home Churches, impatient from lack of faith, or boastful each of its own doings, cry out for converts, and the missionary is tempted to gather any semblance of fruit, without conscientiously inquiring whether it will satisfy the heavenly Master, who will admit no chaff into his garner.—Page 89.

The department of "Notes and Intelligence" occupies thirty-four of the one hundred and twenty-five pages of the number, with missionary information and discussion. One topic, not a little debated in recent years, is thus treated:—

> There is in certain quarters a prejudice against "missionary education," arising from the opinion that education is not a missionary's business; we ought instead, we are told, to be preaching. Our inquiry is, Is not this prejudice, like so many other prejudices, unreasonable? In America and England many Christian men are engaged in the work of educating the young. Some of the choicest Christian spirits that can be found in all Christendom are occupied day after day in giving instruction in the classics, in mathematics, in science, and in philosophy, to numbers of young men who seek instruction from the same motives which actuate Indian pupils—the desire to get a living. Are not their labors wasted? Is it advisable for Christian men—some of them clergymen at that—to spend the best part of

their lives in the drudgery of the class-room, instead of being out in the highways and hedges preaching? The schools in which they teach have in many cases been established by the same class of devoted men, who are well-known contributors to the funds of missionary societies. Have they not put their money to a wrong, because to an inferior, purpose? Would not all the money which has been devoted to the establishment of Christian schools and colleges be better applied if given to the Bible Society? Are not the heathen perishing? Now, nobody hesitates about the proper answers to be made to such questions. Well, then, we ask, is it not just as necessary that the young men of India should have Christian instruction, in order to prepare them properly for the duties of life, as it is for young men in Scotland or Massachusetts? Is there any good reason why a pious professor is *in* his place when conducting a class of American youth through Homer, or expounding the principle of the spectrum analysis in a Scotch university, and *out* of his place when doing precisely the same sort of work in an Indian school? Is there not, in short, much more need that young men in India should have good Christian instruction, simply because the Government furnishes nothing of the sort, and because their other surroundings are so unfavorable to the development of a really noble manhood? Some good people, and some directors of missionary societies, too, we are sorry to say, think that there is only one way in which a man can do good—and that is by preaching. It reminds us of a good but very ignorant old lady, who felt sure that it was her duty to get up in the pulpit and preach, on the ground that it was commanded that the Gospel should be preached to every creature. "Sure enough," said her wise pastor, "but it was not commanded to every creature to preach the Gospel."

If any thing were needed to correct such a wrong idea as we have just referred to, it might be found in the confessions of intelligent natives themselves. The "Indian Christian Herald" and the "Indian Mirror" have both reproduced from the columns of the "Sadharani," a vernacular paper of Calcutta, the following significant paragraph: "With us in Bengal parents and others have not the least interest in the religious training of boys and girls; teachers see not to the religious education of young men; leaders of society have no heart, no interest, consequently no influence, in keeping members of society from evil, and a foreign Government has no hand in the moral character of the great body of its subjects. The result is that, now-a-days, whoever manages to steer clear in life of section 500 of the Penal Code is reckoned virtuous. He whose house has never been searched by the police passes for a gentleman, and the great man who treats people to a garden feast every Saturday is belauded as a saint. Is there a society more degraded than this?"

When such things are publicly stated by Hindus themselves it becomes the opponents of missionary education—for such, we

grieve to say, there are—to bethink themselves if their opposition be not mistimed and misplaced. And it becomes the friends of missionary education to bestir themselves more vigorously than ever.—Pp. 118, 119.

## *German Reviews.*

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Riehm and Dr. Köstlin. First Number, 1878. *Essays:* 1. KLEINERT, Amos Comenius. 2. KAWENAU, The Solemnization of Marriages. 3. KATTENBUSCH, Critical Studies on Symbolics. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. KÖSTLIN, A Contribution to the Eschatology of the Reformers. 2. KOLBE, Exegesis of Ephes. ii, 19-22. *Reviews:* BUDDE, Critical Remarks on Job; reviewed by SMEND.

This number introduces the second half century of the celebrated German Quarterly, and the editors therefore take occasion to give a brief history of its career. It was founded by two professors of theology at the University of Heidelberg—C. Ullmann and F. W. C. Umbreit—with the active co-operation of the publisher, Fr. Perthes. All the three founders occupy an honorable place in the history of German literature. Both Ullmann and Umbreit were prolific theological writers, the former being best known by his work on the Reformers before the Reformation; the latter by his work on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Nearly all of Ullmann's works have appeared in English translations. As regular contributors were mentioned on the title page, Gieseler, Lücke, and Nitzsch, all of whom rank among the most distinguished German theologians of the nineteenth century. Gieseler is the author of a manual of Church history in five volumes, which has been translated into English by the late Professor H. B. Smith, of this city. To Lücke we are indebted for one of the best commentaries of the Epistle to the Romans. Nitzsch has immortalized himself by his great works on the "System of Christian Doctrine," and "Practical Theology." When Gieseler and Lücke died (1855 and 1856) their places were filled by E. Rothe, the author of the great work on "Christian Ethics," and Julius Müller, the author of the great work on "Sin." After the death of Umbreit (1869) Rothe became temporarily one of the editors, and in his place Hundeshagen, one of the contributors. After the expiration of Rothe (at the close of 1864) Ullmann transferred the management of the Quarterly to Hundeshagen and E. Riehm, and Beyschlag became one of the regular contributors. The two

first numbers of 1865 were still edited under the superintendence of Ullmann, who died January 12, 1865. After the death of Nitzsch (1868) Köstlin succeeded him as regular contributor. When Hundeshagen died (1872) Köstlin became one of the editors, and the trias of regular contributors was completed by G. Baur. With the exception of the latter, who is professor at the University of Leipsic, the entire editorial corps is connected with the University of Halle. The *Studien und Kritiken* was intended to be the organ of the new school of German theology, which was founded by Schleiermacher, and which aimed at reconciling the freedom of religious and philosophical speculation with the belief in the Christian revelation and the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. Few periodicals have ever had a more brilliant array of contributors, and have contained a more valuable collection of original essays. The fifty volumes of the *Studien* are alone a vast store-house of theological learning and deserve a place in the library of at least every theological seminary of the Protestant world. Its use is greatly facilitated by general indexes, which have appeared every tenth year. A classified index of all the essays of the fifty volumes is announced as soon forthcoming.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Fourth Number, 1877.—1. A. SCHWEIZER, The Future of Religion. 2. HILGENFELD, Peter in Rome and John in Asia Minor. 3. OTTO, Have Barnabas, Justin, and Irenæus made use of the Second Epistle to Peter? 4. GÖRRES, Was Aurelianus a Persecutor of the Christians when he was still a Governor? 5. HOLTZMANN, Lucas and Josephus. 6. HILGENFELD, The Epistles of Clemens Romanus and their Syriac Translation. 7. Reviews of ZIEGLER, Fragments of an ante-Hieronymian Translation of the Epistles of Peter; of Commodiani Carmina, edited by LUDWIG; of LANDAU, System of Ethics; of PHILLIPS, The Doctrine of Addai.

First Number, 1878.—1. WILKEN, Critical Review of the Relation which exists between Philosophy and Theology according to Kant. 2. BAUR, On Lipsius's Manual of Evangelical Protestant Dogmatics. 3. HILGENFELD, The Muratorian Fragment and its late edition by Jakobus Schuurmans Steekhoven. 4. GORRES, Contribution to a History of the Early Church. 5. KOHLER, The Controversy between Rabanus and Gottschalk. 6. HILGENFELD, The Epistle of James and I. Chr. K. von Hofman. 7. Reviews of WEISS, The Gospel of Matthew and its Lucas Parallels; of Hermæ Pastor, edited by GEBHARDT and HARNACK; of SCHUM, The Acts of Paul and Thecla; of WEINGARTEN, The Origin of Monasticism in the Post-Constantine era; of Barnabæ Epistola, edited by HILGENFELD.

The essay, by Professor Weingarten, on the Origin of Monasticism, which ushered in the new quarterly "Journal for Church History," (see Methodist Quarterly Review, April, 1876,) has been published in book form, and has made quite a stir in the theological world. The work has been generally recognized as

the best that has thus far been written on the subject, and no one will hereafter be able to write on the history of Monasticism without taking notice of the result of this work. Many of the traditional views concerning the origin of Monasticism appear, in the light which is cast upon them by the argumentation of Weingarten, so untenable that they are likely to disappear forever from manuals of Church history. As might be expected from a work propounding entirely new views, there are some points in it on which other scholars who have investigated the same subject differ. Thus Hilgenfeld, in a lengthy review of the work in the first number of the Journal for Scientific Theology, while thanking the author for the light which he has shed on an obscure subject, takes occasion to develop a theory different from Weingarten concerning the real origin of Monasticism. Weingarten had undertaken to trace the beginning of monasteries in Egypt to an influence of the pagan religion, especially to the temples of Serapis, but had rejected any historical connection between the origin of Christian monasteries and Indian Buddhism on the ground that there are no proofs extant of any popular connection of the Egyptian people with the religious ideas of Buddhism, and though Persian and Indian navigators had come to Eastern and Central Egypt, the religious emissaries of Buddhism did certainly not advance westward beyond Cabool, Tabristan, and Koordistan. Hilgenfeld disputes this exclusion of Buddhistic influence upon the origin of Christian monasticism, and undertakes to prove that, on the contrary, there are strong indications of assuming such an influence. He refers to the work of Chwolsohn on the Sabians, who says that an influence of Buddhism upon the Gnosticism of Asia Minor may have taken place, as En-Nedim expressly mentions that Buddhism had entered Transoxiana even before Manes. Professor Weber, the great Sanscrit scholar, finds it highly probable that Buddhist missionaries, impelled by religious enthusiasm, scattered through the wide territories of Western Eran at the time of the Greek rule. If it is further taken into consideration that the road of the world's commerce is also the road of religious missions, Professor Hilgenfeld regards it as a natural inference that Buddhist missionaries may have advanced as far as Egypt. Indeed, a Buddhist writer, who is quoted in Köppen's work on

the Religion of Buddha, (Berlin, 1857,) states that one century after the third ecumenical council of Buddhism, (247 B. C.,) "Buddhism was flourishing at Alexandria, the capital of the Javana country." In a former article in the Journal for Scientific Theology, (1867, I.) Professor Hilgenfeld had tried to prove that the Alexandria referred to by the Buddhist writer, as the capital of the Javana country or Greece, was not the remote Alexandria ad Canoasum, but Alexandria in Egypt. Hilgenfeld furthermore refers to the historical fact that Buddhism was the first religion which introduced Monasticism and united the ascetics for common life. He believes that a direct influence of Buddhism upon the Essenes of Palestine may safely be assumed, for the four divisions of Essene ascetics—the abstinence from anointment, meat, wine, and marriage, the abolition of serfage, and the rejection of bloody sacrifices—all point to Buddhism. An influence of Buddhism upon the Therapeutæ of Egypt is still more probable. These Therapeutæ, according to Mangold, (*De monachatus originibus et causis*, Marburg, 1852,) maintained themselves for a long time, and became at the end of the third century Christian monks. The Essenes, according to Gieseler, appear to have maintained themselves until the fifth century. An influence of Buddhism, through the Jewish Therapeutæ of Egypt and the Essenes of Palestine in the first development of Christian Monasticism is, therefore, regarded by Hilgenfeld as a supposition by no means hazardous.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by BRIEGER. Vol. II. Second number—*Researches and Essays:* 1. NOSGEN, The Ecclesiastical Stand-point of Hegesippus. 2. MEHLHORN, The Doctrine of Human Freedom according to Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν. 3. GASS, The Origin of Monasticism. 4. HERTZBERG, A Few Remarks on the Preservation of Greek Nationality by the Greek Church. *Analecta:* 1. ZAHN, The Greek Irenæus and the whole Hegesippus in the Sixteenth Century. 2. HARNACK, Remarks on Eusebius' Church History, vol. iv, 15, 37. 3. WALTZ, Preliminary Statement on Two Valuable Manuscripts at Riga. 4. WALTZ, Epistolae Reformatorum, vol. ii. 5. MEYER, Correspondence between Melanchthon and Margrave John of Brandenburg.

In the notice given above of another German periodical, The Journal for Scientific Theology, we have taken occasion to refer to the interesting discussions concerning the origin of monasticism which have been called forth in Germany by the appearance of the remarkable work of Professor Weingarten. The Journal for Church History, in its present number, contains a contribution to the controversy from the pen of Pro-

fessor Gass, one of the assistant editors of this periodical, and well known by a number of excellent theological writings. He also bestows the highest praise upon the keenness of the investigations of Professor Weingarten. He believes that hereafter few will be found willing to contend for Paul of Thebes, heretofore celebrated as the first Christian eremite, but whose very existence is emphatically denied by Weingarten. He recognizes the arguments which Weingarten has adduced against the authenticity of the Vita Antonii as a work of Athanasius, as very momentous, though he calls for a new investigation of the literary relation of this work to the genuine works of Athanasius. Many of the assertions of Weingarten are, however, regarded as going too far, and not resting on a sufficiently firm basis. Gass believes, in particular, that an important institution like monasticism, which, though proceeding from a local contact with a foreign worship, had yet met with so rapid diffusion, and had been incorporated into the organism of the Church, and taken root in the theological views of the most prominent contemporaries with such success, that even its excrescences and faults were spared, would be an anomalous phenomenon, if the situation of the Church society at its transition into the broad life of the world had not met it half way. The article of Professor Gass is chiefly devoted to showing the germs of monastic views in the Church of that period.

The remarks of Professor Zahn on Eusebius and Hegesippus refer to a Greek manuscript of the sixteenth century, which, in the opinion of the writer, proves the existence at that time of the Greek original of the work of Irenæus against the Gnostics, which is now extant only in a Latin translation, as well as of the entire work of Hegesippus. Professor Zahn thinks that the important rediscoveries of hidden literary treasures, and especially the complete restoration of the Epistles of Clement of Rome, have revived and strengthened the hope that, in the place of meager fragments and unreliable translations in which at present a large portion of the earliest literature of the Church is preserved, the whole of the original works may yet be recovered.

## Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### OLD CATHOLICS.

Our reviews of the Old Catholic movement have rarely had occasion to refer to France. This country, in which the defenders of the Gallican liberties have for so many centuries been the leaders of the opposition within the Catholic Church to the ultra-papal theories, has sorely disappointed the hopes of those who thought that it would again take a prominent part in the revolt of Catholic scholars against the new corruption of the Church of the Vatican Council. Only a few men of distinction, of whom Father Hyacinthe and Abbé Michaud are best known, have remained steadfast in their adhesion to the Old Catholic cause. Many others who were outspoken opponents of papal infallibility before its promulgation as a dogma, like Father Gratry, ended a long vacillation by final submission. Count Montalembert, the most famous among the lay champions of Roman Catholic interests in France, died without letting the world know whether in case of a longer life he would have submitted to the Vatican decrees, or joined the Old Catholic opposition against them. A considerable number of priests were known to sympathize with them, and about thirty of them found pastoral charges in the French-speaking districts of Switzerland. But in France itself no Old Catholic congregations have been organized. The ultramontane Government has made the utmost efforts to obstruct and prevent the consolidation of the reform movement, and the leaders of the opponents to ultramontanism were either too indifferent in religious matters, or too hostile to religion of any kind, to take the slightest interest in a religious question. Thus France has remained without any Old Catholic congregations and societies, and it has even been without any periodical having the special aim of diffusing information on the progress of the movement in other countries.

The want of an Old Catholic periodical has recently been supplied by the establishment at Paris of an Old Catholic Review, entitled, *La Réforme Catholique.* It is for the present to be published twice a month, and M. Leon Séché signs his name as "Directeur-Géraat." In the three numbers which have reached us we find articles by L. Séché, J. Wallon, Dr. Déramey, W. Jeoffroy, and others. The two latter are priests in the French districts of Switzerland, and Déramey is also a doctor of the Sorbonne. Séché and Wallon are French authors who devote themselves to a defense of the Old Catholic interests in the province of literature. Séché has published several volumes of poems, entitled, *Le Dies Iræ du Mexique, Les Griffes du Lion, Amour et Patrie,* and has announced as soon forthcoming three religious works, entitled, *L'Ancienne Eglise de France, Le Role du Clergé, Regulier dans l'Etat, La Separation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat.* From Wallon we have works on *La Cour de Rome et la France* and *La Verité sur le Concile.* The first number is introduced by a declaration of principles by the editors. They claim to be "men of faith

and of reason, retaining as articles of faith the decisions of the general councils adopted by both the Eastern and Western Churches." They also recognize the decisions of the Union Conference of Bonn, to which all the Old Catholic Churches have given their adhesion. As men of faith they "reject the doctrines and practices of ultramontanism which are called Roman, but which are not Christian; doctrines which have given birth to the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, the consequences of which have been to place the Virgin above Christ, and the Pope above the Church." They also proclaim "their invincible attachment to the Latin Church of the West," the primitive traditions of which have been destroyed by the ultramontanes. They consider the Syllabus "as a law of reaction and of hatred invented by men to whom the Gospel is something obsolete, and to whom the word of the Papal court replaces the word of Jesus Christ." They say they are neither reformers nor sectarians, but that they belong to the great family of Catholics, who have not ceased to labor for reform within the Church without ever breaking with her. The appearance of an organ of the Old Catholic movement in France is of special importance at a time when the general elections held in France have unmistakably shown that the overwhelming majority of all the voters in France refuse an absolute obedience to the behests of Rome. The bishops had been unanimous in denouncing the Republican party to the country; they had ordered public prayer for the success of the Monarchists and of the Government, and even granted indulgences to those who would vote their ticket. That this ticket has, nevertheless, been rejected by so large a majority, may, therefore, be considered an auspicious omen for the future of the religious reform movement. If only France had among its political men as many men as Germany whom strong religious convictions impel to the opposition against Romanism, great results might follow a success of the Republican party in the political crisis of the country. Unfortunately this is not the case. The leaders of the Republican opposition in France, Thiers and Gambetta, have not shown a just appreciation of the importance of a religious opposition to the ultramontane party; and among all the members of the Republican majority in the French Chamber of Deputies there is probably not a single one who has openly identified himself with the Old Catholic cause. The fact, however, that the success of the Republicans imperatively demands the full recognition of the principle of religious liberty will compel the Republicans to include the legal protection of the Old Catholics as a part of their political programme.

The Old Catholic Church of Germany has fully completed its organization, and takes its place among the religious denominations of Germany. It proceeds with great caution in the revision and reformation of its doctrinal and liturgical standards. The fourth synod of the Church, which was held in Bonn, again performed a large amount of important business. The Synodal Council presented a draft of a service of general confession, intended for congregational use as a preparation

for holy communion. This service, though not proposed as a substitute for private confession, which is left to each man's conscience, is expected to largely supersede it. The service is in the form of a Litany, short, and generally in the words of Scripture. The following passage shows the Old Catholic idea of confession, as opposed to the compulsory auricular confession of the Papal Church: "I confess before God the Almighty and all his dear saints, before thee, O priest of the Lord, and before you my brethren." The Synod accepted the service, and authorized the congregations to introduce it. The troublesome question of the abolition of priestly celibacy was revived by motions of various character, and the Synod resolved, by a large majority, that the council should ascertain what, if any, legal hinderances stood in the way of the abolition of compulsory celibacy, and should report on this and on the various motions presented to the next Synod. The vexed question is evidently approaching a solution. The most important matter before the Synod was the revision of the missal and the introduction of the national language. In regard to the latter point, the congregations were permitted to use certain portions of the mass service in a German translation with the consent of the Synodal Council, and it is expected that this permission will be almost universally accepted. In regard to the reform of the mass service itself, they attack first the so-called "application" of mass for various people or societies. They repudiate the Roman Catholic formulary, "This holy sacrifice is offered for," etc., because it favors the opinion that every celebration of the mass is an especial, independent sacrifice, and that the priest can really dispose of its operative virtue. According to the statistical report of the Council of the Synod, the numbers of ascertained, inscribed adherents of the cause in Germany reach 53,640, as against 49,908 last year—an increase of 3,732. This increase is constant throughout. The largest gain is, as usual, in Baden, but also Bavaria produces 770 more members. The numbers are thus divided: Prussia, 35 congregations and 21,797 souls; Baden, 44 congregations and 18,866 souls; Bavaria, 34 congregations and 11,338 souls; Hesse, 5 congregations and 1,155 souls; Oldenburg, 247 souls; and Wurtemberg, 237 souls. The roll contains the names of 59 priests, of whom 55 are actively engaged in parochial work; since the last Synod there have been five accessions, (two newly ordained,) and as many have departed. In Prussia 25 priests are at work, in Baden 18, in Bavaria 12, etc. The sixth Congress of the German Old Catholics was held in September in the city of Mentz, which is well known as one of the strongholds of the ultramontane party in Germany. The president of all the former Congresses, Dr. von Schutte, was absent on account of ill health, and in his place Mr. Schwartzmann, the president of one of the high State courts of the Grand Duchy of Baden, was elected president. It had been very wisely arranged that no reference should be made to the controversies which divide the members of the new Church, and, accordingly, the two most difficult of these controversies, the proposed abolition of priestly celibacy and the liturgical question, were barely mentioned. Both parties, the

conservative and the reformatory, appeared to be desirous to leave the decision to the proper Church authority—the Synod. The most important among the resolutions adopted by the Congress refer to the new efforts made by Rome to obtain a controlling influence upon the State schools. The Congress denounced these efforts as injurious to the best interests of both the school and the State, but at the same time expressed a decided opinion that religion should continue to be an obligatory part of public instruction. Other resolutions recommend an active interest in the wider circulation of the Old Catholic papers, especially the *Deutscher Mercur* and the *Altkatholische Bole*, the support of sick clergymen and of the students of Old Catholic theology. Like its predecessors, the Congress received letters expressive of cordial sympathy from representative men of other religious denominations, in particular from bishops of the Old Catholic Churches of Switzerland and the Netherlands and of the Church of England.

In Switzerland the Christian Catholic Church held its third Synod in Berne, in May. The attendance of the Synod was more numerous than that of the German Synod, fifty-one priests and eighty-nine lay delegates being present. The utmost harmony prevailed between the delegates of German and of French Switzerland. The ritual proposed by the liturgic commission was adopted provisionally for one year. The German Catechism of Salfmann, revised by Bishop Herzog, was recommended to the parishes. The revision of the missal and the re-establishment of the communion in both kinds was also discussed, but the Synod voted to defer action until its next meeting. The Synodal Council consists of three priests and five laymen; among its members are Professor Michaud, the bishop's vicar-general; Pfarrer Schröter, of Rheinfelden, the rival candidate for the episcopate; Pfarrer Hassler, of Olten, a distinguished writer; Mr. Keller, of Aaran, and Mr. Vigier, of Solothurn, both of whom have been landammann, or president, of their respective Cantons. According to the last statistical report, the Church of Switzerland has 55 congregations, 17 associations, 66 priests, and 73,380 members.

In Austria the Government persists in subjecting the Old Catholics to annoying laws, and has thereby succeeded in repressing the movement. In 1876 the Old Catholics had only three parishes and three priests, with about 35,000 souls; but how extensive the sympathy of the educated classes with the Old Catholics is, may be seen from the fact that the majority of the House of Deputies has never ceased to demand from the Government the recognition of the Old Catholics as an ecclesiastical organization. In June, 1877, an interpellation, signed by twenty-nine deputies, was addressed to the Minister of Public Worship, which recites some remarkable facts from the history of the struggle of the Austrian Old Catholics for legal existence. It recalled the fact that a considerable time ago the House of Deputies adopted a bill for regulating the relations of the Old Catholics. The House of Lords did not concur in this resolution, but the committee of the House declared its belief that the Government should expressly recognize the validity of the marriages and

the legitimacy of the children of the Old Catholics. The committee thought that the existing law of Austria fully guaranteed the rights claimed by the Old Catholics, and even the representative of the Austrian Government indicated that the Government would not dispute the right of the Old Catholic priests to solemnize marriage, if they complied with the provisions of the law. The Old Catholics then applied to the Government for permission to organize congregations; but, after waiting about a whole year for an answer, they were informed of a large number of preliminary conditions which they would have to comply with before they could expect a recognition. All these conditions were accepted by the Old Catholics, and accordingly in March, 1877, they once more applied to the Government to keep its promise and to recognize them. No answer being received, the twenty new deputies asked the Government how it could explain the long delay, and whether it was now resolved to recognize the Old Catholics as an independent religious organization.

In Italy the Old Catholic movement has numerous advocates. It has warm friends in the Italian Parliament, and even in the State ministry. At the close of the year 1876 Luigi Prota-Giurleo was elected bishop by a general election, at which over 10,000 votes were cast. The full separation of the friends of the cause from the Papal Church, and the organization of independent Old Catholic congregations, has, however, not yet taken place. It is a good omen for the future success of the Old Catholic Church that the opposition against the Vatican Council and against the temporal power of the Pope has, among the educated classes, and even among the lower clergy, more numerous adherents in Italy than in any other country. The most notable among many proofs of this fact is the recent dismissal from the Order of the Jesuits of Father Curci, one of the oldest and most learned members of the Order, and for a long time an editor of the foremost of all ultramontane organs, the *Civiltà Cattolica*. Few men in Italy have done so much as Curci for the defense of the interests of the Roman Catholic Church, but he has recently fallen out with his party by advocating a recognition of the kingdom of Italy and an acquiescence in the abolition of the temporal power. In June, 1875, Curci wrote a long letter on the subject to the Pope himself, which in March, 1877, appeared in the *Revisto Europea*, and created an immense excitement. Curci was ordered to retract his sentiments, and, when he refused, was forced to ask for his dismissal from the Order to which he had belonged for fifty-two years, in order to escape expulsion. It is reported that the agitation among the clergy throughout Italy, in Rome itself, and even in the Jesuit ranks, on the expediency of a compromise, and a reconciliation of the Church with the State in Italy by an acceptance of accomplished facts and a renunciation of the Pope's claims to a temporal sovereignty, is gaining ground with a rapidity which causes no little disquietude at the Vatican court. Among the men won over to the views of conciliation advocated in Curci's writings is said to be Cardinal di Pietro.

## Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

Dr. E. Spiess, of the University of Jena, has published a history of the development of the views concerning the condition of man after death. (*Entwicklungsgeschichte der Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode.*) The work is divided into three divisions. At first he treats, in five chapters, of the subjects which constitute the basis for the belief in a future life, namely, the views concerning the substance and origin, as well as the destiny and the fate, of souls, (chap. i, ii,) the history of death, (iii,) funeral rites and graves, (iv,) and the arguments for the belief in a future life, (v.) A second division, in twelve chapters, reviews the eschatological ideas of (i) the barbarous nations, (ii) the Egyptians, (iii) the Chinese, (iv) the Indians, (v) the Persians, (vi) the Greeks, (vii) the Romans, (viii) the Celts, (ix) the Germans, (x) the Slavs, (xi) the Jews, (xii) the Islam. Lastly, the author gives the results of his comparison of different religions. He shows that, in some form or other, the belief in an existence of man after death is a belief common to the human race, and that without it a noble conception of human life is not possible. The great learning of the author is generally recognized in the German reviews of this book.

An important work in favor of the separation between Church and State has been published by Professor Maassen, of the University of Graz, in Austria. (*Neun Capitel über Freie Kirche und Gewissensfreiheit.*) The author of this work has repeatedly changed his religious opinion. By birth a Protestant, he first became known as a writer of ultraconservative views. He then, like several other representative men of that party, became a Roman Catholic, and received an appointment at an Austrian university. At the beginning of the Old Catholic movement he was in full sympathy with the opposition to Papal Infallibility, but subsequently found fault with the further development of the Old Catholic movement, especially with its support by the State Governments in Germany and Switzerland. He still regards himself, like the Old Catholics, as a member of the Catholic Church, but continues in his opposition to the Vatican Council and its decrees. A large portion of the work is devoted to a development of the views of the author concerning the true relation between Church and State, and it may be inferred from what has been said before, that on the one hand he finds in the past history of this relation much to blame and little to praise, and that, on the other hand, his own views are not palatable to any of the large religious parties in Germany. The great scholarship of the author is, however, generally recognized, and his work is regarded as a most valuable contribution to the literature on the relation between Church and State. The study of the historical relations between these two great powers is now pursued in Europe with renewed eagerness. A very able work on the history of this relation in Switzerland has been begun by Professor Gareis, formerly of

the University of Berne, (now of Giessen,) and Professor Zorn, of Zurich. (*Staat und Kirche in der Schweiz.* Zurich, 1877.) The first volume has recently been issued, and the remainder will soon follow.

The most important work which has yet been published on the Vatican Council is undoubtedly the work of Professor Fiedrich, of the University of Munich. (*Geschichte des Vaticanischen Koncils.* Bonn, 1877.) The author attended the Council as the "theologian" of one of the German prelates, was one of the most determined opponents of the proposed doctrine of Papal Infallibility, and, remaining firm in this opposition after the promulgation of the doctrine, became one of the leaders of the Old Catholic movement. He had previously gained by a number of works, especially by his "Church History of Germany," the reputation of one of the best Catholic historians of the present time. The first volume of the work, which has recently been published, contains the history of the Roman Catholic Church during the nineteenth century, which is treated of so fully because without it, as the author says, it is impossible to obtain a correct view of the work of the Vatican Council. The first volume is divided into four books. In the first two the author briefly traces the origin of the papal system and its development until the end of the eighteenth century, the preparation of the Council by founding an ultramontane party in France, Germany, and Switzerland in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the third book he speaks of the special measures adopted during the pontificate of Pius for preparing the Catholic world for the Council, and in the fourth book he treats of the "Introduction of the Council." The second volume will be devoted to the history of the Council.

## FRANCE.

The "French Cyclopedia of Religious Science," by Lichtenberger, (*Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses.* New York: F. W. Christern,) is rapidly progressing. The second volume, which has recently been completed, contains the articles from "Baader" to "Censure." The high literary character which distinguished the first volume is fully sustained in the second, and we feel no hesitation in repeating the opinion expressed in a former number of the Methodist Quarterly Review, that this Cyclopedia may be regarded as the most important work which has yet been produced by Protestant France. A remarkable feature in this Cyclopedia is the co-operation of all the theological parties found among the Protestants of France. In the *Comité Directeur*, Viguié, Colani, Réville, and Maurice Verne represent all shades of liberalism; Bois, Bonifas, J. Monod, Dhombres, Decoffet, Bersier, Stapfer, Recolin, Sayous, the evangelical party of the Reformed Church; Matter, Philip and Samuel Berger, the Lutheran Church; Pressensé, Lelièvre, and Hollard, the Free Churches. The list of contributors contains several scholars who are not Protestants, among them the Orientalist Oppert, who has contributed the article "Babylone." On French subjects, the second volume again contains a large amount of interesting information which one would look for in vain in the Cyclopedias of other languages.

## Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes.* By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Three vols., 8vo. Vol. I, The History of the Creeds, pp. 941. Vol. II, pp. 557. Vol. III, pp. 880. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

These three noble octavos fill a vacant space with a most valuable occupant. They are a rich present to our English and American theologians. Winer's "Confessions of Christendom," translated by Pope, is a masterpiece of concise comparative Christian theology, and from its lesser price is more available for the ordinary Christian scholar; but no presentation of the creeds of our holy Christianity in our English language is at all comparable with this. It is the second and third of the three volumes that contain the creeds, these being preceded by a historical and theological survey in the first volume. The second volume contains the Greek and Roman creeds. First we have the brief confessions found in the Bible, especially in the New Testament, together with many passages in the New Testament that seem to refer to confessional forms used in the Apostolic Church, some of them baptismal. Next follow the Antenicene confessions found in the early post-Apostolic fathers, as Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 107; Irenæus, 180; Tertullian, 200. The *formulæ* furnished by these three writers are plainly the originals of the Apostles' Creed, so that essentially that creed is unquestionably an apostolic document. These *formulæ* are traced through the leading fathers of the first three or four centuries, and Dr. Schaff furnishes a very interesting comparative table of their contents. To the student of the earliest Christian antiquity this will appear an invaluable chapter. Then follow the five Ecumenical Creeds, accepted alike by Greek, Roman, and Protestant Churches, a rejection of which by any Protestants Dr. Schaff pronounces to be "heretical Protestantism." These, with the exception of the Athanasian, are all Greek creeds. The five Roman Creeds, beginning with that of Trent, come next. Then we have the three Greek and Russian Creeds. The Old Catholic manifestoes close this volume. The third volume is made up of the great body of Protestant creeds. First are the Lutheran symbols, second the Reformed, and third the modern Protestant. The Lutheran, in whose framing Melanchthon had an important share, differs not widely in its soteriology from our Wesleyan-Arminianism, while the so-called Re-

formed are more or less stringently Calvinistic. Professedly the Reformers went back to the Bible for their doctrines, but, unfortunately, it was to the Bible with its rays refracted through the intervening Augustine. The Greek Church, on the other hand, in whose language both the New Testament and the most primitive post-apostolic documents were written, is what we call Arminian.

Dr. Schaff's own Introduction, embracing the entire first volume, is, of course, done with great scholarship and ability. Besides a vast amount of pure and valuable history, he furnishes with entire freedom a great variety of individual opinions of his own, with some of which we should venture to differ. The entire work possesses great value for the entire Christian Church, and will long stand as a monument to the honor of its author.

A general survey of the Creeds suggests some reflections. First, at a glance, in chronological order they may be with measurable accuracy classified as Greek, Latin, and Teutonic. The first Christian Church was not Roman. The Romanistic claim to primal antiquity is falsified upon the very face of the records. Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, and Corinth are all anterior to Rome. The New Testament is not Roman but Greek. And all the truly Ecumenical Creeds (under which head we scarcely reckon the pseudo-Athanasian) are Greek. It is not until the fifteenth century that an originally and purely Romish Creed appears. It may, without much qualification, be said that this succession of Creeds marks the real ethnographic march of Christianity.

Second. There is a remarkable doctrinal succession. The early Creeds, at the early Christian centuries, were largely occupied with Christology. The personality of Christ is the central point of discussion, and the relations of all other matters to him are the surrounding topics. A trinality, though not the well-defined Trinity, appears in the Apostles' Creed. A Socinian can repeat that Creed without much violence to its words. But Christ, as Son of God, founder of the Church, and judge of quick and dead, is the main topic of doctrine.

Third. It is not until the sixteenth century that in the Tridentine Creed, framed by Rome in self-defense against Protestantism, that Rome shapes a doctrine of atonement, and semi-predestination into an authoritative formula. A short time previous the Lutheran, or rather Melanchthonian, theology had done a similar thing. The doctrine of predestination in the first three Christian centuries was a heresy. It was the dogma of the Gnostics. The

early Church repelled it, used against it the same arguments as our modern Arminians, and excommunicated it as hostile to the very fundamentals of Christianity. It was not until the so-called Reformed Church framed its Creeds that, under the influence of the lurid genius of John Calvin, unqualified predestination obtruded itself into a public Christian Creed. This heresy was imperiously enthroned as orthodoxy. Old Gnosticism became new Christianity. The so-called Reformed Churches took Augustinianism, aggravated its worst points, and exalted them into a test of true faith. On these points the Creed of Trent is better than the new Creeds. This was the doctrinal deformation of the Reformation. A period of dead pseudo-orthodoxy naturally followed. The Reformation needed to be reformed, and that work was performed by James Arminius doctrinally, and by John Wesley spiritually. And this, the union of the truth and the life, was *the completion of the Reformation.* How slowly works the power of truth! "God is patient, because God is eternal."

---

*That Review Article.* By Rev. GEO. D. WATSON, D.D. Published by National Publication Association for the Promotion of Holiness. 24mo., pp. 33. Philadelphia.

The "That Review Article" of this pamphlet is Dr. J. O. A. Clark's article, published in a late number of our Quarterly, and the pamphlet itself is a fierce and fiery onslaught and part of a volley all along the line upon the article and the Quarterly. The article is held to be heretical, and the Quarterly is solemnly denounced as untrue to Methodism, and its editor as attempting to overthrow the true doctrine of sanctification.

The article of Dr. Clark we do not hold to be exactly Wesleyan. At any rate it can be held as only *generically* Wesleyan, and on a *specific* point or two anti-Wesleyan. It is Wesleyan in that it holds up a Christian perfection as a definite object of aspiration and efforts, and does not, with Calvinism, hold that all progress consists in a deepening consciousness of sin. But Dr. Clark distinguishes between sanctification and perfection. Sanctification (he does not say entire sanctification, but a sanctification complete as measured by the then capacity of the man) he places at justification; while perfection, as *absolute*, belongs to God, yet as *relative* belongs to man, and consists in making due progress by experience and faith toward the absolute. So far in point of its doctrinal facts Dr. Clark appears to be Wesleyan; but there are two points on which he seems to diverge—one a point of doctrinal

fact, and the other a point of terms. The *first* is that he denies that definite experience sometimes called the "second blessing;" the second is that, while Wesley uses the term *perfection* to designate the definite state attained by the "second blessing," Dr. Clark applies it to that due progress toward the blessed absolute which constitutes a healthful and vigorous piety. In the fact of that progression Wesley is as decided as Dr. C.; for Wesley does not make the "second blessing" a stopping point. It is a stage which admits an eternal progress beyond. So far, then, as doctrinal points are concerned, the negation of the definite second process, analogous to our first conversion, is Dr. Clark's only divergency. He would, we suppose, admit that there is a "second blessing," but deny its equalizing co-ordination with our first justification; and he would admit a *second* only as he would a *third*, a *fourth*, up to a *thousandth* and more; it being the Christian's privilege to go on from blessing to blessing, and from strength to strength, until he mounts into glory. And so, perhaps, he would say, with one of the holiest ministers of our acquaintance, "I have been entirely sanctified forty times."

We did not and do not understand Dr. Clark as affirming that what we mean as entire sanctification takes place at justification. He does, indeed, maintain that a complete sanctification takes place at justification, as measured by the *then* capacity of the man; but not an "entire sanctification" as measured by his matured capacity. This distinction enables us to answer the question, Why is the man not *entirely sanctified* at justification? The distinction is, we take it, neither Wesleyan nor anti-Wesleyan, having never been affirmed or denied by Wesley. In his article Dr. Clark uses many expressions which describe justification in high terms, and which, if toned up to a high interpretation, would seem to imply entire sanctification; but so does Wesley. There is, perhaps, nothing in the article stronger on this point than the following words of Wesley:—"The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. He is 'born again, not of blood, nor of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' He is a child of God, a member of Christ, an heir of the kingdom of heaven. 'The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus.' His very body is a 'temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God through the Spirit.' He is 'created anew in Christ Jesus:' he is *washed*, he is *sanctified*. His heart is purified by faith: he is cleansed 'from the corruption that is in the world.' 'The love of God is shed

abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto him.' And so long as he 'walketh in love,' (which he may always do,) he worships God in spirit and in truth. He keepeth the commandments of God, and doth those things that are pleasing in his sight: so exercising himself as to 'have a conscience void of offense, toward God, and toward man.' And he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified."

This passage contains expressions which, if Dr. Clark had used, would have been quoted as anti-Wesleyan. That is, both writers describe rather than define. A high-toned interpretation of Wesley would make him contradict himself, and a high-toned interpretation of Clark would make him contradict Wesley under a low-toned interpretation. We understand Dr. Clark as affirming that the work of the Lord in justifying, and at the same time regenerating and sanctifying the man, is perfect and complete after the then possible lesser measure, and not according to the future fuller measure. And we see nothing anti-Wesleyan in it.

We shall now be asked in tones of terrible stage thunder why we published an article containing such a divergency in the Quarterly. Before we answer that question we must ask our dear thunderers what they are making this mighty racket about. They are themselves ready enough to accept and eulogize Methodist books and articles containing very strong anti-Wesleyan positions. Dr. Raymond's "Theology" is anti-Wesleyan on the very important topic of eternal retribution, yet the Standard heralded that work in its columns under stately capitals as "A Great Book," and eulogized it, if we rightly recollect, without qualification. Dr. Curry, in the Advocate, abolished the bodily resurrection, and in the Repository has abolished the judgment-day; yet when the learned doctor avowed himself to be "Inskipian," inventing that graceful adjective in order to invest himself with it, the "Inskipian" organ gracefully and gratefully responded, if we rightly recollect, by pronouncing him "the foremost editor in Methodism." We object not to the eulogies on the book or on the editor; but we do object to this inconsistency, if not insincerity, in indorsing any and every other heresy, and yet putting on such fierce visages and unpacking themselves in such fierce fulminations upon such a divergency as Dr. Clark's. We must charge these brethren with playing fast and loose. They have assumed to take one doctrine under their patronage and the Church under their authority, and while all other doctrines may be denied, this one article must be strictly maintained under penalties.

They threatened that if the late Dr. Lore editorially opposed them they would undermine the subscriptions to the Northern Advocate. They proposed to burn Dr. Crane's book in "the stove;" they called upon the Church authorities to put him down; they wrote to the editor of the Quarterly to speak out and demolish him officially and ecclesiastically. What our revolt at their spirit and conduct was we have freely expressed in a former Quarterly; and we now say it deliberately, that we hold all their professions of superior sanctity to be a serious mistake.

On our statement in our last Quarterly that it was by the light of another world only that life in this world is relieved from pessimism, Mr. M'Donald thinks proper to say that if we were sanctified we would not think so. Our sentiment, we reply, was the same as that of Muhlenberg's hymn. One of our own sweetest hymns most sweetly sings—

> "Lord! obediently we'll go,
> *Gladly leaving all below.*"

These words speak the deepest feelings of our own heart, and so feeling, we need none of Mr. M'Donald's volunteer prescriptions. We decline all profession of entire sanctification; we refuse all such process as these brethren enjoin; and yet we have a firm trust that we should hail with joy unspeakable the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour. Welcome be the hour of our release from these low grounds of earth, for when Christ appears, then shall we also appear with him in glory! St. Paul says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Mr. M'Donald might say, "You would not feel so, Paul, if you would only come and be sanctified like me." We imagine that the apostle would decline.

But the question remains, Why publish an article not perfectly Wesleyan? Because we believe that had John Wesley been editor of our Quarterly he would have published it. Dr. Clark is an eminent minister of the Church, South, of marked ability and piety. His article is written in the interest of holiness, and is pervaded with a devout spirit which should benefit every reader not a partisan. There are increasing thousands, many of them repelled by the intolerable assumptions of high professionalism, who would be holier Christians after Dr. Clark's interpretation than after the Wesleyan, exaggerated as that at the present day is. We believe the thoughtful men of the Church had a right to hear what he had to say on this most deeply interesting subject. The Quar-

terly is not a child's paper. It is read by the highest minds in the Church, who know what our standard doctrines are and what they ought to be. They do not require the Quarterly to be an *Index Expurgatorius*. When it comes to deciding precisely what our doctrines are, the editor has ever tried to do his best toward defining them. His definitions claim no other authority than what they derive from their real accuracy. And when they have been so defined, as the doctrine of sanctification has been editorially defined, we see no reason why the best and most tried minds of the Church may not be allowed some range. So, after having most strenuously maintained the doctrine of a literal resurrection, we did not hesitate to allow Prof. Lacroix to put in Schoberlien's views modifying that dogma. We hear very audibly the expressed demand that there shall be some freedom of expression allowed to the highest and most loyal minds in the Church who write truly and sincerely in the interest of truth and holiness. Our readers will remember that in a former Quarterly we showed up the anti-Wesleyan, or rather hyper-Wesleyan, character of the Standard; and we now say that we consider Dr. Clark less divergent, and less perniciously divergent, from Wesley than Inskip, M'Donald, or this Dr. Watson. And as to the spirit exhibited, we have only to ask any fair mind to read Dr. Clark's article and Dr. Watson's pamphlet in immediate succession, and decide on which side the real holiness lies.

We believe that our wisest men are troubled with the increasing amount of an imperious antinomianism pervading many sections of our Church, arising from the multiplication of hasty professions of entire sanctification. In an oppressively numerous class of cases that profession constitutes the man's only importance. He uses it to place himself above the just criticism to which all are rightfully amenable. To doubt his holiness is, forsooth, to be an enemy of holiness. Meantime his profession, and a fervid assertion thereof, are about the only reasons for suspecting him of any special excellence. The practices of his daily life, his bad tempers, and his questionable rectitudes, oblige him largely to draw upon the "infirmity" excuse. What would be *sin* in an unregenerate or in a poor justified man is merely human failing in him. His sins are all sanctified sins, until in his case Christ is made the minister of sin, and Christianity is demoralized into a cloak for sin. And that is antinomianism. And when such Christians grow strong in a Church they are partisan, censorious, arrogant, and the real troublers of Israel. The chiefest pastors

of our Church testify to the great increase of this portentous evil, and they very well know from what quarter the evil comes. But how pull up the tares without injuring the wheat? How reach the evil without destroying some good? How even discuss the matter and speak plain truth without offending many a truly holy soul? As a remedy, some wise and holy men, like Dr. Crane and Dr. Clark, suggest a modification of our theology. The excited manner with which such men are assailed by writers like Dr. Lowry and Dr. Watson, in contrast with the calm, devout spirit of the men themselves, shows on which side the real holiness lies. We insist that men like these, tried by long service in the Church, shall be heard, though their counsel be not adopted. And if there be thousands in the Church who can be holier under such views rather than on the second-process view, all wise men will say, *let holy life be preferred above all special dogma.*

It is painful to see the great name of Count Zinzendorf debased into a term of opprobrium by these mistaken brethren. In spite of what we consider his doctrinal errors, Zinzendorf was, as Schaff says, "one of the purest and most remarkable men in the history of Christianity, a religious and poetic genius, a true nobleman by nature and divine grace as well as by rank. He had but one all absorbing passion—Christ and him crucified." Dr. Clark's doctrine and his bear no resemblance. He taught that our sanctification is entire at justification; Dr. C. says no such thing. He taught that our sanctification is entirely imputed from Christ; Dr. C. that it is wrought in us through Christ. It is a pity that one who prints himself a D.D. should so mistake, especially after the mistake has been once corrected in our Quarterly. Dr. Clark's doctrine of sanctification is no more Zinzendorfian than it is Swedenborgian or "Inskipian."

---

*Bishop Peck's Address to the Ministerial Candidates of the Southern Illinois Conference.* Minutes, pp. 120.

Two of our bishops have expressed their views with some fullness in regard to the doctrine of Christian holiness, with the evident purpose of maintaining the thing, but of disentangling it from some present embarrassments. Bishop Merrill illustrates at full length the great doctrine, that while in various departments of existence we know the *fact*, we know but little of the *mode*. The conclusion is, that upon the subject in hand we need not be over technical or exacting about the form or the formula, if we can secure in reality and essence the thing. The argument is too con-

secutive to allow of piece-meal quotation, but our readers should study it as a whole.

Bishop Peck, in his address to the candidates of the Southern Illinois Conference, deals in points sharply and sometimes brilliantly put. He first states the Wesleyan doctrine very distinctly, and gives it as

THE UNEQUIVOCAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

I desire, my brethren, to assure you that in the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church on this subject there is nothing hidden or doubtful. The Church has no question about this doctrine. Individuals may have questions; some minds may honestly differ about some phase of this doctrine; but as to the main thing the Church has no doubt whatever. For it does seem to us that the idea that there is no definite blessing which ought to be sought, called entire sanctification or perfect love, and distinct from a love that is not perfect, is not true.—P. 92.

The Bishop then proceeds to give some *caveats*, which are specially suited to the hour. The first is upon

THE ULTRA ONE-IDEAISM.

But it is possible for a man to be so filled with zeal for holiness as to give it a technical position that will do some harm. I somewhere saw a representation of Satan laying hold of a man's shoulders who was trying to get up to a certain line; finally he gave him a push which sent him clear across it. "Well, go then," said he; "I would as soon see you on one side of the line as the other." I therefore say to you, brethren, you must not omit before the world "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," a justification by faith, and regeneration, and the beginnings of sanctification at the time of regeneration, and then going on to perfection. You must take care of the little ones, and you cannot do that by preaching the highest standards of Christian excellence chiefly and principally. You must go down where they are, and lead them upward and onward, and so preach and teach that the humblest and poorest of all can understand it. You must remember that you are not to be the pastor of a dozen persons devoted to holiness, but the pastor of the whole flock; and ninety-nine in a hundred of them, perhaps, cannot readily understand the matter. It is a great flock, and there are many weak ones. Take them all along, brethren—preach the whole Gospel. It is a Gospel of power to wicked men, and the majority of your hearers are wicked men. It is a Gospel of mercy to penitents; take them and lead them to the altar of mercy and to the Saviour of sinners. There is no work of greater importance than teaching those to walk who cannot walk themselves. A great many of the members are away down in the valley of indecision, and you must not underrate them, but form them into line, bring them up, and try them, not by the "Central Idea of Christianity," but by the Bible. Brethren, I learn that through this country there are some men who do not harmonize with us upon this question, and I partly believe it. I have found them every-where. And just the way not to give them power is at proper times and places to preach the true doctrine of Wesleyan holiness. I recommend to you not to fight them, but to preach in this way and *live it out*, and your cause will take care of itself.—P. 93.

These pointed remarks suggest a query as to the whole system of one-ideaism. The holiness association, the holiness periodical, the holiness prayer-meeting, the holiness camp-meeting, the holiness preacher, are all modern novelties. They are not Wesleyan. We believe that a living Wesley would never admit them into the

Methodist system. They seem to distort the healthful symmetry of our religion. Wisely was it asked by one of our bishops, "Are not all our meetings holiness meetings?" Is it not the purpose of our whole system to "spread Scripture holiness?"

The third caution regards

OBTRUSIVE "EVANGELISTS."

But it has come to my ears that men have been goingaround the country, entering your pastoral charges, and ignoring you and your work. Now, pastors are responsible as pastors, and brethren, men who call themselves by good names, evangelists, etc., (and do not understand me that I am against the word, for it is scriptural,) but many times it turns out that erratic men assume to themselves this title, and, without consulting with the pastor, set up for themselves, and become harsh accusers of the brethren, and preach in a way we cannot approve, and in this way do much harm.—P. 94.

A fourth touches upon

LOFTY PROFESSIONALISM.

And now a word about the profession of holiness. I am of the opinion that every man who tells his experience ought to tell the truth just as it is. And I do not think that the Church is suffering for the want of religious profession. A high profession may be quite imprudent when it only provokes resistance. But when you are in the family with your brethren and sisters, and are clear in the experience, do not suppress it. If the heart is filled with holy love, let the people know it. But then I want to tell you that if a person is filled with perfect love he will have less need to tell it. If his life is in accordance with it, he does not need to tell it; it will tell itself, and if not, his telling it will do no good. Let his life be such that the world may know that he walks with Jesus, and then when his heart is filled with perfect love he may tell it to the glory of God. I never knew any harm to come from that kind of profession. But when there was a harsh, censorious spirit, and a man did not live well, and every body knew it, I have known loud professions to do great harm. There are not wanting instances of men and women who are very irregular in their attendance at church, not very steady at the prayer-meeting, very generally away from class-meeting and yet professing perfect love.—P. 94.

These words, coming from the author of the "Central Idea of Christianity," will have great weight throughout the Church.

---

*The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ.* By GEORGE B. FISHER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. Author of "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity," "The Reformation," etc. 8vo., pp. xii, 591. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1878.

The scope of Dr. Fisher's work is even more broad than its title would at first seem to indicate. While its first part professedly only describes the condition of the Roman world at the entrance of Christianity, it really explores the entire field of the intellectual and moral preparation for the Gospel found in the ancient religions and philosophies of Rome, Greece, and Palestine. The line of thought in the early chapters is deeply interesting, and, though not wholly new, its development is fresh, scholarly, and inde-

pendent. The introductory chapter, on "The Nature of Christianity and its Relation to the Jewish and Heathen Religions," ably delineates the divine training of the Hebrew people, and this, namely, the training of a people, and not the making of a book, it holds to have been the grand aim under both the old dispensation and the new. The method of revelation is not in the announcement of a body of doctrine, but in a series of historical phenomena, in which men act, and over which God presides in his providence, guiding, legislating, punishing, and delivering, the true import and philosophy of which are expounded by prophets and apostles. The correct exposition of the facts of the Gospel history is found in the apostolic epistles. As the history was slow in its development, the discoveries of revelation were progressive and gradual. No student of the Scriptures can have failed to mark, for instance, the steadily growing definiteness of the Messianic prophecies, the higher level of David and Isaiah than that on which Moses stood, and the slow uplifting of the idea of the kingdom of God. So Dr. Fisher would solve many of the moral difficulties in the Old Testament, by refusing to judge men and deeds of a darker age by the light of the Gospel; and this is, in our view, the correct solution. But Christianity is the perfect form of religion, in which revelation reaches culmination. It grows directly out of Judaism. It could not grow out of Platonism, or any of even the best forms of heathenism. It is not a religion of ethics chiefly, or of some special doctrine, as immortality, but it is a religion of redemption and grace. This is its essential characteristic, in which it differs from all other religions, except in its foreshadowings in the Old Testament. Dr. Fisher might well have more fully elaborated this peculiarity.

The Roman empire is regarded as a preparation for Christianity, in its breaking up of nationalities and welding them into one; in the influence of its jurisprudence in unifying the popular thought; in the assimilation of its people in language and culture; in the necessary intercourse between the different parts of the empire; and in the longing for a common religion that, with the dissolving of old beliefs, sprung up out of the confusion and ferment of the times.

Dr. Fisher devotes some seventy thoughtful pages to the consideration of the popular religions of Greece and Rome. We fail, however, to discern the "incipient tendency to monotheism" in the Homeric theology, of which he speaks. The truth is, as seems to us, that polytheism had failed to utterly obliberate the senti-

ments of the ancient religion and original monotheism, and they still gleamed, though dimly, in the darkness of paganism. Idolatry was a departure from Jehovah, and never could be a school-master to lead men to Christ. But with the Greek philosophy the case was different. Great ability marks the treatment of this question, and it is no discredit to Dr. Fisher that he reminds us often of the more thorough work of Dr. Cocker on "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." Then, with an inquiry into the morals of heathenism and the social and religious condition of the Jews, the view of the state of the world at the time of our Lord's advent is made complete.

The second division of the work examines the Gospel narratives in the light of the latest criticism. We fully appreciate the candor and thoroughness of these investigations; yet we note with some surprise the basing of the early date of these books in any degree on an alleged expectation by the apostles of our Lord's second advent in their life-time. A wise logician would naturally avoid a premise so disputable; and the assumption of such an expectation involves the fatal mistake of supposing that the Holy Ghost inspired the apostles to write a falsehood on an important point of Christian doctrine. Surely some other interpretation of the passages adduced must be found.

The third division discusses a few of the most important topics in the life of our Lord and the history of the Church in the first century. On a few points, such as the measure of apostolic authority, and the opinion that baptism was commonly by immersion, we should speak differently; yet no one can read these chapters, especially the one on "The Separation of the Church from the Temple," without profit. As a whole, the work is a valuable addition to our theological literature, and a credit to our American scholarship.

---

*The Hidden Life.* Thoughts on Communion with God. By Rev. Adolph Saphir, author of "Expository Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews," "The Life of Faith," etc. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Carters. 1877.

Quite a number of books have been published of late on the "higher life." This one is not on the higher, but on the hidden, inner life, the conscious experience at which every true believer should aim from the beginning of his Christian life, and without a good degree of which he should at no time be content. Turning from the much debated questions in regard to the exact nature of the work wrought in regeneration, and the sense in which Christians may be said to keep the divine law, the author treats such topics as these: "Sincerity in Drawing near to God," "The Experienced Reality of Revela-

tion," "The Experienced Reality of Prayer," "The Indwelling of God by Love and the Holy Spirit," etc. The author does not presuppose doubt, and proceed to argue on antagonism, and to defend his views. He explains, and enforces, and exhorts, with all earnestness, and even enthusiasm. He sets out with the declaration that, although every mystic may not be a Christian, "every Christian is a mystic." The book, it must be confessed, agrees very well with the opening sentence. Read as a theological work, it lacks clearness, strength, and completeness. Read as an interpreter of the innermost wants, exercises, and experiences of those who are not satisfied either with the barren formalism of a machine piety, or with the cold performance of all known duty, it will be found an incentive and a guide in the deep things of the conscious religious life. Nevertheless, those who would explore these mystic realms need a solid foundation in the Law as well as in the Gospel, else they will be liable to become dreamily and sentimentally pious, resolving all religion into the things of the inner life, and forgetting that true Christians are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

The Hidden Life is an English work, although that fact is nowhere plainly stated in the volume itself.

---

*Abraham, the Friend of God.* A Study from Old Testament History. By J. Oswald Dykes, M.A., D.D. 12mo., pp. 352. New York: Carters. 1877.

If modern curiosity had been previously consulted in regard to the size of the Bible, it would have clamored for a whole library, when divine wisdom has given us only one book, and that none of the largest. With what delight would we pore over the Life of Adam, in three volumes, embellished with portraits and a map! Seth, Enos, and others in the line which extends from the Creation to the Deluge would each require an octavo, while the scientific questions which cluster around the Creation and the Deluge might be discussed in a supplemental work of moderate dimensions—six or eight volumes, perhaps. Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and others in the immediate line of succession could not be crowded into any less space, certainly; and, by a moderate estimate, the Christian era might be reached in a hundred volumes. If all that man fancies that he would like to know were written of Christ and his apostles, their words and works and personal history, at least a hundred more volumes would be needed.

But what could the Church do with so voluminous a Bible? Certainly no society could be formed for its general gratuitous distribution. The poor could not buy it. The busy world would plead that they had no time to read it. The soldier could not carry a copy in his knapsack, nor the sailor one in his sea-chest. Books of extracts would be looked upon with suspicion as one-sided and misleading, contrived to support the notions of those who made the selections. Nay, verily; it would not do. The wisdom of the divine Author is seen, not only in what is revealed, but the brevity with which mighty truth is told.

And yet man, without the divine teachings, is constantly trying to supply what inspiration has omitted, and expanding pages of revelation into volumes of fanciful description and thoughtful moralizing. Often, as in the present case, the work is well done; and the golden nugget found in the Scripture mine is beaten into a broad expanse of shining leaf. Sometimes, indeed, it is somewhat thin in spots; and now and then, by reason of much pounding, a hole is discernible; nevertheless, the precious metal is still there, and the glittering expanse catches and holds many eyes which would hardly see the solid value of the nugget.

The work of Dr. Dykes is one of the best of its class. It supplements the brief records of Genesis with the fruit of much thought, as well as varied acquisitions of modern Bible study and historical and geographical inquiry. Now and then he employs his fancy, but it is only to put a little flesh upon the dry bones of the story, and it is always done in the best of good taste. No thoughtful reader will close the book without feeling that "Abraham, the Friend of God," and the persons and events of his time, stand before his eyes with clearer outline and more vivid coloring than before, and that the hours spent in the reading have been well employed. C.

---

*Brighter than the Sun*: or, Christ the Light of the World. A Life of our Lord for the Young. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. With Illustrations by A. ROWAN. 8vo., pp. 433. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

Dr. Macduff could crown his life-work by no nobler task than is accomplished in this volume. He has, heretofore, written, as our readers are doubtless aware, of Bethlehem, Sychar, Gennesaret, Bethany, and Olivet; and now he brings his long study of the Scriptures, his observations in the Holy Land, and all his experience and skill as a writer, to the elucidation of the life and character of the One from whom those lands derive for us their highest interest. The facts of the gospel narrative are, of course, set

forth in due order, and interpreted in the light of wide reading and long study; but the charm of the book is in its vivid descriptions of events and scenes, so that it is a fairly-pictured life of our Lord. The young person who is fortunate enough to read it will see the beautiful and wonderful story as he never saw it before. In this most important respect the work is unequaled in our language. The sixteen full-page illustrations and illuminated cover add greatly to the attraction of the volume.

---

*Theological Essays.* By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 8vo., pp. 383. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877.

The seven essays in this volume were published some years since, and have appeared in several editions, but are, for the purpose of the present publication, revised and enlarged. They abound in strong thought, firmly and clearly expressed, and in this the reader of a different school of theology will take a pleasure, while he may dissent from the theory propounded. The essays on "The Doctrine of Original Sin" and "The Atonement a Satisfaction for the Ethical Nature of both God and Man," professedly defend the old historical Calvinism, and may be accepted as its latest statement from the hand of a master in its Israel. An Arminian eager for the fray would relish the following unflinching proposition: "Every child of Adam fell from God, in Adam, and together with Adam, and, therefore, is justly chargeable with all that Adam is chargeable with, and precisely on the same ground, namely, on the ground that his fall was not necessitated, but self-determined. . . . If [Adam] fell freely, so did his posterity —yet not one after another, and each by himself—but altogether and all at once, in that first transgression." Dr. Shedd, of course, would not accept the reply that it is impossible for a man to personally will and act, and become responsible therefor, a thousand ages before he has a personal existence.

---

*Hermeneutics of the New Testament.* By Dr. A. IMMER, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by ALBERT H. NEWMAN. 8vo., pp. xvii, 395. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1877.

This work, prepared for students and practical clergymen rather than professional theologians, fully expounds the principles of New Testament exegesis which for a generation have prevailed in Germany, and are really those adopted by Grotius and other Arminians two and a half centuries ago. It is a thoroughly scientific and almost exhaustive treatise on the whole subject. It is in three

parts: I. The General Principles of Hermeneutics; II. The Single Operations of the Scripture Interpreter; III. The Religious Understanding. The elaborate history of Scripture interpretation and the several methods of exegesis that have from time to time been employed, constitutes a very important portion of the work. Our author adopts the grammatico-historical method, and rightly holds that our dogmatic preconceptions must not be the standard of our interpretation of Scripture. It is with us a fundamental proposition that we are to interpret the Holy Scriptures upon the same grammatical, historical, and logical principles on which we interpret any other document, never forgetting, however, that he will with such aid most deeply penetrate into their import whose soul is illumined by the Holy Spirit. To learn how most wisely and accurately to do this, the student can have no better guide than Dr. Immer's erudite volume. We heartily commend it to our young ministers in particular, in the belief that in mastering it they will greatly enrich their teachings of the sacred word.

---

*Future Religious Policy of America.* A Discussion of Eleven Great Living Questions. By WILLIAM RILEY HALSTEAD. 12mo., pp. 218. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

The discussions in this volume are on important and vital questions intimately connected together, and deeply affecting both the religious and secular welfare of our country. Mr. Halstead thinks strongly and writes vigorously, with the purpose of carrying his reader with him, and the hope of making him a truer Christian and better patriot. The first essay, on "Law and Providence," is itself worth the price of the volume; and of the rest, those on "Skeptical Thought," "Romanism," "Priesthood of the People," and "Inner Church Life," merit special attention. A book so important in its topics, and fresh, brave, and direct in its utterances, ought to be put into the hands of the large body of intelligent, active young men of the Church, upon whom is now devolving so much of its practical work.

---

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Final Philosophy*; or, System of Perfectible Knowledge issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion. By CHAS. WOODRUFF SHIELDS, D.D. Pp. 609. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877.

Irrelevant and inconclusive arguments are vexatious and mortifying, both to the logician and the truth-lover, even when they are offered in support of a good cause. This work claims to be

the outcome of a professorship of "Harmony of Science and Revealed Religion," and from its size and title one is justfied in expecting more than is given. Of course there is a "conflict;" and the larger part of the work is spent in describing it. The old story of the astronomical and geological conflicts is retold, with much other matter of a similar sort. This is gracefully, though somewhat sketchily done; but the reader is left in doubt to what purpose. The scanty lesson which might be drawn from this deluge of history, namely, that religion can survive profound changes in our cosmical conceptions and scientific theories, seems nowhere to be hinted at. We are of opinion that the "conflict and reconciliation" business is very much overdone on both sides, and is really a sure mark of hopeless superficiality. In truth, the presented conflict is mainly a conflict of old and new science, and not a religious question at all. It has a religious significance only because our religious sentiments become adjusted to certain conceptions which constitute the reigning science; and when those conceptions change there must be re-adjustment. In the first shock of surprise, and especially where mental ossification has set in, we fancy that religion has been damaged, if not destroyed. In the law this same aversion to re-adjustment produces violent opposition to law reforms. In medicine it sets the schools at war, and makes any startling change an occasion for persecution. In politics it produces conservatism. Whenever and wherever a new order appears it will have to make its way against the old. Had Dr. Shields mastered this simple thought, it would have very much altered the plan of his work. It is a miracle that the science of the Bible should have been as pure as it is, especially considering the state of scientific knowledge at that time; but the wonder consists mainly in the fact that so little science of any kind found its way into the Bible. The belief in the divine omnipresence was so overpowering that no theory of second causes was needed or allowed. Hence the science of the Bible is seldom any thing but pure theism, with all secondary causes left out. This is the cause of its scientific purity, and the reason why there is so little where the Bible can possibly collide with any form of science which remains theistic. But when Paul in his prayer adopts the threefold division of body, soul, and spirit, or when in his vision he speaks of the third heaven, we find no reason for calling these or any similar statements more than the prevailing science upon these points at that time. For ourselves, therefore, we have little respect either for the writers of "conflicts," or for the writers of

"reconciliation." The method of the former is to sweep a dragnet through the past, and collect all the horrors which have attended progress, and then charge them all to religion. The latter commonly has no method, except meekly to allow all the slanders and libels of the former, and then cry out, "For any sake, don't!" In this way the notion has got abroad that all scientific people are irreligious, and that all religious people are unscientific. Along with this goes the notion that any dogmatism may be called science if only it be grossly impious. Now, in the face of the facts that the bulk of our scientific men have always been Christians, and that atheists and materialists have contributed almost nothing to the advance of knowledge in any department, we submit that it is high time to abandon this pernicious habit of speaking of science and religion as hostile powers. Dr. Shields's conception of what is really needed in this department is painfully inadequate, if we are to judge by this work. So far as there is any conflict, it reduces to the question whether certain facts and doctrines are true or false. Such are the doctrines of theism, of the supernatural control of things, of revelation, etc. Has any thing been discovered which discredits these beliefs? Here is the knot of the problem; and all fruitful discussion in this field must confine itself to these points. Mere general talk about the hostility of science and religion is unworthy any rational being, whether scientific or religious. Philosophic discussion of the problems indicated will always be valuable when the work is well done. All other "reconciliations" are worthless at best, and often by their lack of reason they lead the superficial, who are always willing to burn their fingers, if they can, to imagine that nothing can be said. Dr. Shields has not given us any thing conclusive, and he has not shown any just appreciation of the question at issue. One can hardly look at the 609 pages of this large octavo without inquiring "To what purpose was this waste made?" It is a relief to get a hint from the preface that the chair of "Harmony, etc.," is not a permanent institution. If President White's "Warfare" and Dr. Draper's "Conflict" were to meet with a terrible retribution for their philosophic shallowness, we know of no infliction more adequate, and more poetically just, than that those authors should be forced to study the Final Philosophy.

*Contemporary Art in Europe.* By S. G. W. BENJAMIN. Author of "The Turk and the Greek," "What is Art?" etc. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 165. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

This volume is issued in the belief that our country is just entering upon an era of art development, and with the purpose of in-

struction in the principles which underlie a true art culture. It takes us successively to England, France, and Germany—to their painting, sculpture, and architecture—describes their characteristics in those countries respectively, introduces us to their artists and art schools, and illustrates the text by seventy-seven engravings. The book, with its illuminated cover and elegant press-work, is itself a fine specimen of our American art.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Summer Rambles in Europe.* By ALEXANDER CLARK, Author of "The Gospel in Trees," "The Old School-house," "Work-day Christianity," "Starting Out," etc. Printed for the Author. 16mo., pp. 280. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1877.

Never did worn and weary editor more joyously drop office and work for the rest of vacation, or ramble hither and yon, and tell the story of his ramblings with a freer *abandon*, than did our genial friend and brother of The Methodist Recorder in the summer of 1876. His route of travel lay through Great Britain and north-western Europe, and rather in a line of his own choosing than in the usual one prescribed by fashion. He saw with his own eyes and thought with his own brain, and from time to time sent home some account of it all, to the great delight, we are sure, of his readers; and now from those letters and other equally rich material this book is made. It is thoroughly readable, from the excellent portrait fronting the title-page to the end. Whether it tells of exploring English castles, sitting in Shakspeare's house, meeting the Primitive and New Connection Methodists in conference, mangling Dutch to an English waiter, studying art galleries and cathedrals, roaming in the Black Forest, or lingering in John Calvin's church, in Geneva, one wearies not of its pages. Its style is perpetually varying with the author's moods—now bright, sportive, and keen as a Damascus blade, and anon sober as the grave. With plenty of entertaining incident and anecdote, and charming description of scenes, places, and people, Dr. Clark has happily combined many profound thoughts and important facts, making an instructive as well as pleasant volume.

*Lectures on Baptist History.* By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

We have here three hundred and fifty pages of reading that kindles the best sort of feeling, and is very rich in historic allusions

and the clearest and most beautiful rhetoric. The title of the book is somewhat unfortunate in suggesting dull statements and sectarian defenses, but the name of the author is an agreeable offset to the title. The twelve chapters in the volume are entitled, "John the Baptist," "The Kingdom of God as set up by Christ," "Baptism and Regeneration," "The Church as Left by Christ and as Made by Man," "Our Churches under the Ban of Antichrist," "The Anabaptists of the Continent and England," "Rationalism in its Relation to our Churches," "The Baptists and Religious Liberty," "The Baptists of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate," "John Bunyan," "Baptists and Missions," and "Baptists and the Future." The two prime chapters in the book are the one on "John the Baptist" and the one on "John Bunyan." That on "John the Baptist" presents, perhaps, as complete a delineation of the Great Forerunner as has ever been made. One fairly sees the hardy preacher of the wilderness in the midst of five thousand swarthy Syrians, clothed in his rough coat and leathern girdle, and shaking the hearts of his startled hearers as the forest is shaken by the tempests of winter. The illustrations of this chapter are as fresh and fragrant as the flowers of spring, and as rugged as the mountains. They are the legitimate children of the talented writer. Dr. Williams has earned a foremost place among the scholarly writers of the religious school in this country. He is a true poet, and a genuine, liberal-hearted Christian. It is a little amusing that the good doctor should have made John the Baptist a frontispiece to a book on "Baptist history." It is simply playing with a word. The old agitator, the rugged interferer with the conscience of Herod and the brazen sins of his sister-in-law, Herodias, belonged to the Baptist society about as much as Paul to the Presbyterian, or St. Peter to the Methodist. All these old-time saints had finished their course with joy long before *our* time people had ever been thought of, and to snatch them up as figure-heads to our little ships is an arrangement that those masterly men who were in at the beginning of things would hardly appreciate. Take it all in all, our sister denomination may feel proud of their historian, and American literature of this new book.

---

*Among the Turks.* By CYRUS HAMLIN. 12mo., pp. 378. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

Dr. Hamlin has given us a volume of surpassing interest, both for its incidents and personal narrative illustrative of life in Turkey, and for its information respecting the condition and progress of the

empire. It is now forty years since he was sent by the American Board to take charge of its educational work at Constantinople, and to him is chiefly due the success of Robert College, on the Bosphorus. The chapter relating to this Christian institution, whose students are gathered from eighteen native cities, twelve languages, and all religions, and in whose faculty American, Greek, Armenian, Bulgarian, German, Italian, French, and Turkish professors labor in harmony, is one of the most interesting in the book. In Dr. Hamlin's thirty-five years in Turkey he has become thoroughly conversant with its condition, its laws, institutions, religions and social life. Many of his pages illustrate them by graphic narratives of travel, personal experience, and interesting incidents. The three concluding chapters, entitled, "Mohammedan Law," "Islam," and "Signs of Progress," convey some ideas widely different from those commonly cherished, and his facts show a large progress made in the last half-century. He believes in Turkey, notwithstanding all its errors. No rebel cruiser in our late war was allowed to be got up in Turkish waters; and even toward an enemy he holds it neither immoral nor unchristian to allow the truth. He points to the schools, the books used, the fifty newspapers (thirty of them dailies) of the capital, the Scriptures freely sold in twenty languages, the growing literature, and some remarkable changes in the administration of affairs. The long list of names of Christian subjects who have been admitted to high civil offices as ministers, viziers, and embassadors is significant. His prescription for the *sick man* is Peace, Time, and Education.

---

*The Two Circuits:* A Story of Illinois Life. By J. L. CRANE. 12mo., pp. 502. Chicago: Jansen, M'Clurg & Co. 1877.

A curious conglomerate of broad humor, keen wit, shrewdness, good sentiment, bad taste, bad English, and typographical errors, in the life of a western itinerant, done in *opera bouffe*.

In the middle of October, 18—, Philip Force sets out on his first circuit, and in the space of one short year passes through four hundred and forty pages of variegated experiences. He forms the acquaintance of a large number of people, good and sensible in the main, but coarse in manner, and generally given to the use of language which requires to be spelled in new and fantastic ways. There are no indications of a plan till the reader is more than half through the book. On page 329 Mr. Force meets a little damsel of sixteen, and, notwithstanding his solemn engage-

ment to Mary, is smitten with the charms of Kate, who is equally smitten. He is loyal to his first choice, however, and never tells his second love till the proper moment arrives. But Mary comes to visit a friend, rides a runaway horse, is thrown to the ground, and departs this life pathetically. Kate is adopted by a rich relative and disappears, and Force, in a very depressed state of mind, goes to Conference, and receives a new appointment, where he blossoms into a great preacher. A robbery, a murder, and a suicide throw their shadows on the canvas. Kate comes upon the scene again, and just in the nick of time. Force finds in a borrowed book a letter written to Kate's mother by the rich relative, in which she informs the said mother that she, the said relative, suspects that Kate is afflicted with a secret attachment to a young minister by the name of Force. After this revelation, no judicious reader will need to be informed of the result. They marry triumphantly.

The book, with its sense and its nonsense, its burlesques and broad farces, its admixture of parlor and stable scenes, its numerous cats and dogs, pigs and horses, will be popular, we judge, among people similar in mind and manners to those chiefly described in it. A score of appropriate illustrations assist the imagination of the reader. C.

---

*Growth of the Spirit of Christianity from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era.* By Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.A. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 375, 396. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877.

American readers of theological works from abroad will recognize Mr. Matheson as the author of a spicy and instructive little book on "Aids to the Study of German Theology." In this last undertaking we find him entering a new and broader field, and indulging in generalizations and groupings which put his powers to the severest test. He seems to endeavor to furnish, though without formally stating it, an antidote to Lecky's "Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Skepticism in Europe."

The general treatment of the subject is the more difficult because it is the old ground covered by Neander, Rothe, Pressensé, and just now by our American Fisher. We give Matheson's drift: Christianity was a divine phenomenon, and, while it had the power to destroy error, it could also assimilate to itself every thing pure and good in the contemporaneous ethnic faiths. In this way it asserted its prerogatives. Its method of meeting other religions proved its sympathy with universal man. Paul was the

boundary line marking the beginning of the universal Christian supremacy. The Church never showed its full grandeur until persecuted. Its divinity shone through the fire. It would not compromise with error. It could not undergo mixture. Hence, Gnosticism became its foe. The union of the Church with the State under Constantine was without conscience on his part, but it was not without its use in preparing Christianity for its future relations with man in his social and political life. Scholasticism, with all its quibbles, was educating, in that it proved a discipline for the mind endued with truth, in its great long fight with error. But the failures of the schoolmen were numerous, and their work would have been entirely fruitless but for the saving Reformation of the sixteenth century. Not all the errors of scholasticism disappeared with Protestantism, but it was henceforth powerless for evil. The mediæval heart had been yearning for the joy of deliverance from the long bondage, and at last it came with the Vulcan of the Erfurth monastery. But Luther's work was not simply a new departure; it was reflexive upon the half-dead Roman Catholicism. All that Romanism possesses to-day that is worthy of honor has been derived from Protestantism. Its greatest foe has been its saving force.

---

*Autobiography of Rev. William Arnot*, Minister of the Free St. Peter's Church, Glasgow, and afterward of the Free High Church, Edinburgh: and Memoir by his daughter, Mrs. A. Fleming. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

The Rev. Mr. Arnot was born at Scone in 1808, and died at Edinburgh, June 3, 1875. His father was a farmer, and the son spent his early boyhood employed, as far as his years admitted, in the same occupation. He afterward was apprenticed to a nobleman's gardener, and, while learning the trade, felt the power of divine truth, and became a member of the Presbyterian Church. From his childhood he had manifested mental activity and a thirst for knowledge; but the quickening influence of religion upon his mind was such, that his whole plan of life was changed. He studied for the ministry, and in 1837 was licensed to preach by the University of Glasgow, and was appointed assistant to the Rev. John Bonar, who had charge of two country Churches. Remaining about a year in this position, he became pastor of St. Peter's Church, Glasgow, where he remained from 1839 to 1856, when he was called to the Free High Church, Edinburgh, where he spent the remainder of his life. Thus it appears that, entering

upon his work at the age of thirty-one years, he spent thirty-six years in the ministry, and died at the age of sixty-seven.

The life here set forth contains nothing but "such as is common to man;" nothing of romance or tragedy, but honest Christian living and good Christian work in the sphere to which God had called.

Mr. Arnot was a faithful minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring all the counsel of God, and laboring earnestly among the people, the poor and the friendless as well as the rich and the respectable. He found time, also, to do good with his pen, writing much for religious periodicals, and publishing a number of volumes on "The Church in the House," "The Roots and the Fruits of the Christian Life," etc. He also found time to visit the Continent and America, coming hither in 1870 as a delegate from the Free Church of Scotland to the United Assembly of the Presbyterian Churches, and in 1873 to attend the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York city. The work is a pleasant record of a good man's life, and especially interesting to those who knew him personally, or through his writings.

## *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*Alcohol and the State; A Discussion of the Problem of Law, as Applied to the Liquor Traffic.* By ROBERT C. PITMAN, LL. D., Associate Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts. 12mo., pp. 406. New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House. 1877.

Alcohol is the rending devil that possesses what are termed the Christian nations; and every-where his victims are seen, ofttimes falling into the fire and oft into the water, or gnashing their teeth in drunken madness, and wallowing on the ground foaming. And many that see and deplore the ruin wrought, and have tried one expedient after another with only partial success, or none at all, are in much the same state of mind as were the disciples when they asked their Lord privately, "Why could not we cast him out?" We do not believe that this problem will always defy solution, or that the successful way of working will be forever hidden. Nay, the way has already been found, and the volume before us shows very clearly where it lies.

Judge Pitman's valuable work is divided into two general parts. Part I, "Alcohol versus the State," contains ten chapters on Waste, Destruction of Home, Pauperism, Public Health, Crime, Vitiation of Human Stock, The Universal Ally of Evil, The Universal Antagonist of Good, etc. It comprises about one fifth of

the book. Part II, "The State versus Alcohol," contains sixteen chapters, and discusses topics of vital importance, such as these: The Province of Law, The Extent of Legislative Power, License Laws and their Failure, Half-way Measures, Prohibition a Success, Law as a Teacher, Enforcement.

We wish to say, with emphasis, that among the numerous volumes published in furtherance of the temperance reform, we can hardly name one so deserving of careful study as this. The personal character of the author assures us of his candor and truthfulness; his position in the judiciary of his State vouches for his eminent qualifications for the task to which he addresses himself. The thorough research evident every-where shows that nothing has been lost by reason of haste or impatience, while the calmness of the style gives increased weight to the conclusions reached. Judge Pitman's verdict is, that legal prohibition of the traffic is the right weapon with which to fight the gigantic foe, and that prohibitory legislation is right in principle, justified by the magnitude of the interests directly involved, and abundantly proved to be efficient by numerous local experiments in England and America. We trust that this work will obtain the wide circulation to which its great merits entitle it, and we are sure that if it does it will give a powerful impetus to the greatest reform of the age.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*The Protestant Queen of Navarre, the Mother of the Bourbons.* By VIRGINIA F. TOWNSEND. Four Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 329. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Illustrated Historical Sketches.* By ANNIE MYRTLE. Sixty-one Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 366. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Pictures from our Portfolio.* Arranged by ANNIE MYRTLE. One Hundred Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 206. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Distinctive Feature of Methodism.* By Rev. L. D. BARROWS, D.D. 18mo., pp. 44. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*The Boys' Pocket Library.* Vol. I. 24mo., pp. 249. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*The Kirkwood Library.* By Mrs. EMILY HUNTINGTON MILLER. Five Volumes. "Summer Days at Kirkwood," "The Bear's Den," "A Year at Riverside Farm," "Uncle Dick's Legacy," "Fighting the Enemy." 16mo. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*A Knight of the Nineteenth Century.* By Rev. E. P. ROE, Author of "Near to Nature's Heart," "From Jest to Earnest," "What Can She Do?" "Opening a Chestnut Burr," "Barriers Burned Away," etc. 12mo., pp. 582. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1877.

*Little Head Wise;* or, Sermons to Children. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston. 16mo., pp. 357. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

*Short Studies on Great Subjects.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Third Series. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877. Price, $2 50.

Nine essays on a variety of topics, mostly republications, in the easy, graceful style of the former series.

*Elsie's Children.* A Sequel to "Elsie's Motherhood." By MARTHA FINLEY (Farquharson,) Author of the Story of "Elsie," "Casilla," "Wanted a Pedigree," "Old Fashioned Boy," etc., etc. Pp. 349. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co.

*A Golden Christmas.* Being Longley's Manual for 1877. Pp. 112. London: F. E. Longley.

*Our Children's Songs.* Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 207. New York: Harper & Bros. 1877.

*The Khedive's Egypt;* or, The Old House of Bondage under New Masters. By EDWARD DE LEON, Ex-Agent and Consul-General in Egypt. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 435. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Personal Appearance and the Culture of Beauty, with Hints as to Character.* By T. S. SOZINSKEY, M.D., Ph.D. 12mo., pp. 196. Phila.: Allen, Lane, & Scott. 1877.

*The Expositor,* July, 1877. Edited by Rev. SAMUEL COX. Contents: 1. The Holiness of Jesus Christ. 2. St. John's View of Jesus on the Cross. 3. The Reign of Law an Incentive to Prayer. 4. The Gospel of the Uncircumcision. 5. A Chapter of Gospel History. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

*Illustrated Annuals.*

*Art Decoration applied to Furniture.* By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 237. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Pottery and Porcelain of all Times and Nations.* With Tables of Factory and Artists' Marks for Use of Collectors. By WILLIAM C. PRIME, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 531. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*The Book of Gold and other Poems.* By JOHN TOWNSEND TROWBRIDGE. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 81. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Novels.*

*In Silk Attire.* By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "Green Pastures and Piccadilly," "A Princess of Thule," "Three Feathers," "A Daughter of Heth," "Madcap Violet," etc. 12mo., pp. 313. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*A Modern Minister.* Two Volumes. Illustrated. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 166. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*What He Cost Her.* By JAMES PAYN, Author of "Won—Not Wooed," "The Best of Husbands," etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*A Young Wife's Story.* By HARRIETTE BOWRA. 8vo., pp. 121. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Marjorie Bruce's Lovers.* By MARY PATRICK. 8vo., pp. 105. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Carita.* By Mrs. OLIPHANT, Author of "Mrs. Arthur," "For Love and Life," "Squire Arden," "Chronicles of Carlingford," "Innocent," etc. etc. 8vo., pp. 193. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

---

## WESLEY AS A GREEK BISHOP.

We have inserted the Article on the supposed Erasmian ordination of Wesley as bishop, not because we are at all convinced of its reality, but because it needed discussion, and because the best possible argument in its behalf is already furnished by Dr. Phoebus. Yet we hold the argument to be so total a failure as to set the question fairly at rest.

1. The only testimony in its behalf is the statement of Dr. Peters. But the article of Mr. Kingsley, preceding, completely shows that

Peters is no authority at all. His inveracity is such as to cancel all he says. Yet even he does not pretend to be "in the secret;" that is, he was not present, and does not know when or where it was done, or who were the actual witnesses. He mentions a few persons who, as he says, believed it, but does not pretend that even those persons were present. There is no other reason than his word for believing that the persons named believed it.

2. The statement at the close of Peters' letter that Charles Wesley believed it is abundantly contradicted by Charles Wesley's own words. His charge against John was that he "consecrated a bishop" without himself being a bishop. The least thought in Charles Wesley's brain that John was a truly ordained bishop would have expunged his entire argument.

3. As to the faintness of Wesley's denial, it is plain that he denied all that was charged. Neither Lloyd, nor the searching Toplady, nor any other man in England, imagined that the ordination was really *performed;* they only charged that it was *asked*, and that Wesley denied. From that day to this nobody in England ever charged that it was *performed*, except Peters.

4. Peters' stories seem contradictory. Wesley, by his account, did not dare to admit to "a clergyman" that he had been ordained a bishop, yet he is ready to ordain Seabury, which would be in itself a conspicuous admission of his own ordination. Moreover, the statement that he was ready to *act* as a successionally ordained bishop, and yet not so sign himself, is absurd enough.

5. We imagine that no date can be fixed when Wesley commenced autocrat. He was autocrat from the beginning, only his autocracy ruled a smaller domain. As the masses grew larger, and the questions more momentous, his autocracy grew into larger action. His express declaration that successalism was a "fable" is proof that no action of his was based on episcopal succession.

6. The story of Peters dishonors Wesley. It makes him violate the law of the land and incur a severe penalty to obtain an honor he dared not acknowledge, and so could never use. He might, indeed, have avoided the penalty by securing due proof of his episcopate to be read after his death in support of the American episcopacy. But that he never did. On the contrary, his diploma for Coke to use in America assigned reasons for his ordination of Coke which contradict the idea of his own successional episcopate.

We should deem the fact of such an ordination a great danger to the free and voluntary nature of an episcopacy.

# Methodist Quarterly Review.

## APRIL, 1878.

### Art. I.—EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY.

[First Paper.]

Scientists, so-called, are now more than ever making battle over the Mosaic history, and Christian apologists are too ready in conceding the ground to them. Colenso abandons the verity of the sacred narrative itself; Stanley, after Ewald, pleads lamely for its alleged inaccuracies; Tayler Lewis tries to synchronize the demiurgic "days" with the indefinite periods of geology; and J. P. Thompson virtually surrenders the patriarchal generations in favor of the longer cycles presumed to be called for by the Egyptian annals. Böckh requires for these last a space of 5702 years B. C.; Brugsch, 4455; Lepsius, 3892; and Bunsen, 3623. But the Hebrew text allows only 2515 years B. C. for the flood, on the most liberal extension of the *lacunæ* in the period of the Judges, (the Rabbins make it 2104, Usher, 2348;) and if, with many accommodating chronologers, we adopt the longer scheme of the Septuagint version, we gain but little toward an approximation, (Jackson, 3170; Hales, 3155.)

Here, indeed, is a difficulty! No wonder that interpreters and historians have puzzled themselves with the problem, and ordinary scholars have altogether eschewed the task of its solution. The case, however, is not hopeless. Among acknowledged experts in this branch of archæology, Osburn ("Monumental History of Egypt," London, 1854, 2 vols., 8vo.)

makes violent efforts at adjustment, adding or retrenching whole centuries in a dynasty at a stroke. Others have been more sober. Reginald Stuart Poole, by an ingenious parallelism of the Egyptian dynasties, which he states was first suggested by Mr. Lane, reduces their commencement to B. C. 2717, (*Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, London, 1851, 8vo.) The well-known Sir Gardiner Wilkinson adopts this arrangement, but expresses himself more cautiously as to the duration of the early dynasties, beginning his definite dates with the fourth and fifth, B. C. 2450, (Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii, 289, Am. ed., where his latest views are given.) Among scholars not professed Egyptologists we may mention the late learned Dr. Samuel Farmer Jarvis, who diligently applied himself to these studies, and succeeded in detecting many of the causes of discrepancy, ("Church of the Redeemed," Boston, 1850, 8vo., appendix.) We propose to state concisely the substantial contents of the original sources, both monumental and historical, from which the chronology in question is derived; to ascertain briefly what is their respective authority; to examine their principal coincidences and variations; and to see if any rational method of reconciliation has been or can be devised.

I. *The Monumental Records, and their Use.*—These we enumerate in the order of their completeness and importance.

1. *The Hieratic Papyrus of Turin.*—This contains a regular list of the Egyptian kings from the first (Menes) down to the close of the fifteenth dynasty, written in the sacred (or cursive hieroglyphic) character, on a single sheet of papyrus, and now preserved in the Museum at Turin. It gives not only the names and their chronological order, but likewise the years, and, generally, months, and even days, of the reigns of most of them, with intimations of their divisions into dynasties and families. It was evidently drawn from State documents, and were it perfect it would be of inestimable value. Unfortunately, however, it is literally composed of innumerable fragments, of all shapes and sizes, with numerous gaps between them, and abrasions on the edges.* As we looked upon its

* On recurring to our memoranda, made on the spot, we find that, although the entire papyrus is scarcely a yard square, we counted more than 400 separate pieces, following the lines of juncture by the eye. The blank spaces are very numerous, and scattered all over the document, especially at the beginning, being of all forms and sizes, from one tenth of an inch to an inch and more in diameter.

tattered appearance in the glass frame where it is kept in the Museum, we felt bitterly disappointed when we reflected how easily its bits might have been wrongly put together, and what errors may have resulted from the conjectural arrangement of its scraps and the *lacunæ*.* We said to ourselves, Is it possible that this piece of patchwork is held up as of paramount authority on this subject, to the exclu-

* "This papyrus is broken into very small fragments, which were put together about twenty [now forty] years ago by Seyffarth, a German scholar, and the originator of a mode of reading hieroglyphics which has long been exploded as a mere flight of fancy. It was according to the interpretation of its meaning which he imagined his system afforded that he pasted together the scattered morsels of the papyrus that remained of this manuscript. Champollion had perceived that it was a list of the names of kings when he first visited Italy, in 1825. Lepsius and Bunsen extol the arrangement of this manuscript by their countryman as a prodigy of critical acumen and mechanical exactitude, and claim for it, in its present condition, the authority of an undoubted historical document. For ourselves, after some experience in the arrangement of broken papyri, both in this country and in Egypt, we must confess we are altogether in the dark as to the principle upon which Seyffarth proceeded in the restoration of the confused mass of morsels of papyrus inscribed with a writing of which it now plainly appears he did not know a single character. Until this point is explained, we feel at a loss to understand the grounds upon which we are required to accept as facts of undoubted history the royal names of which it contained a list, and which, according to the calculations of Lepsius, amount to about 250."—Osburn, "Monumental History of Egypt," vol. i, p. 227. "Such is the vagueness of form in the hieratic characters, that no two students are yet agreed as to the import of the majority of the kings' names contained in it."—*Ibid.*, p. 124. "If we have rightly divined the purpose for which the Turin Papyrus was compiled, it will certainly follow that it was a history of the succession of the kings of Egypt written for the express purpose of prepossessing the minds of the young persons for whose use it was intended with notions of the antiquity of the kingdom as inflated as it was possible to induce them to receive. The proof of this is evident enough. The list begins with dynasties of gods reigning in Egypt for untold millennia. Then follow the demi-gods, whose rule in Egypt lasted for 23,200 years. Menes and the rest of the mortals, down probably to Amosis, the conqueror of Memphis, follow these, as in the Greek lists, which were evidently copied from similar documents. We repeat the same objection, *in limine*, to this Egyptian original that we before urged against the Greek translations. If we admit all the 250 kings which it probably enrolled as the names of real men, upon what principle do we reject all the gods? It is just as easy to invent the one as the other, and to write the names of fictitious kings in hieratic characters as in Greek or any other letters. In a point of general direction, like the one we have deduced from it, the Turin papyrus may serve as history; but to translate, as best we may, the hieratic characters into hieroglyphics, and to present them in the order in which they occur there, and upon its sole authority, as authentic lists of the kings of Egypt, is, in our judgment, to write history upon very slender evidence."—*Ibid.*, ii, 125 *seq.*

sion of well-preserved and unmutilated annals? Lepsius and Wilkinson have, indeed, both published it as restored, but it certainly could never have been got together intelligibly without the aid of some other document. Moreover, it omits altogether many names found in other lists, both monumental and historical; it gives the names of very many which the others ignore; it often divides the dynasties differently from them, (making in all but eight instead of fifteen, if the principal divisions only are reckoned, and eighteen if the subdivisions are included;) it gives no regnal years for the first two dynasties, and disagrees in almost every instance in the rest with those assigned by the parallel histories; finally, the names themselves, where legible, frequently exhibit slight, if any, traces of those contained in the other accounts. In short, the whole list confuses the subject nearly as much as it helps.

2. *The Tablet of Abydos.*—This is a similar but far less extensive list of kings, carved in ovals with hieroglyphics proper on the walls of one of the subterranean passage-ways in the temple called the Memnonium, at Abydos, in Upper Egypt. We were disappointed, when there, in not being able to see it, as the passage has been closed up by order of the Egyptian Government.* This tablet contains the names of seventy-seven kings, of the first nineteen dynasties, beginning with Menes, and ending with Rameses III., (B. C. cir. 1155.) The length of none of the reigns is given; very many omissions occur, (for example, the whole of the seventh, ninth, and fifteenth dynasties;) and the names agree but vaguely with those known in history.

There is also an "old Tablet of Abydos," found in an adjoining temple, now in the British Museum, which was evidently copied from the above, and contains the names of only a part of the same kings.

3. *The Tablet of Sakkárah.*—This is a block similar to the last, found in the mortuary chapel of a priest at Sakkárah, in Lower Egypt, and now in the Museum at Cairo. (It was not there, however, when we visited the Museum, not having returned from the Vienna Exposition.) It contains the names of fifty-seven kings, beginning in the middle of the first dynasty, and

* We have, however, in our hands the account of it, with a fac-simile, published by M. Mariette in the *Revue Archéologique*, (1866.)

ending with Sethos I., (B. C., cir. 1300.) It corresponds in the main quite closely to the Tablet of Abydos, but it contains several more names, while it omits a few, and leaves out the whole of the eighth dynasty, which that Tablet alone gives in full. It gives no regnal years.

4. *The Tablet in "The Hall of Ancestors,"* originally found in the rear chamber of the great temple at Karnak, Thebes, and now in Paris, contains the names of sixty predecessors of Thotmes III., in hieroglyphics proper, but not in such order and completeness as to make it very available for the present discussion. Poole gives a conjectural arrangement of its contents, (*Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, p. 126.)

5. *Detached "Stelæ."*—This name *stelæ* is given to separate inscriptions containing the name and lineage, more or less complete, of some royal or sacred personage. The most important of these are the famous "Apis Stelæ," discovered by M. Mariette in the walls of the Serapeium, or mausoleum of the deified bulls at Sakkárah. The magnificent granite sarcophagi are still open to visitors in one of the three galleries, but the inscribed slabs, to the number of five hundred, have mostly been removed to the Louvre, in Paris. They are chiefly *ex-votos* in gratitude for some piece of good fortune, and record, besides the name, etc., of the offerer, the date frequently of the current reign, and not seldom a synchronism in the life of the existing Apis. These fragmentary data are of very considerable service in fixing the duration of partial reigns, and occasionally in other ways.

More isolated inscriptions relating to a few contiguous reigns or to individual kings are found scattered among the monuments, and throw a scanty light upon the other materials, chiefly by way of corroboration or correction.

There are certain other writings extant of the ancient Egyptians, particularly the so-called "Book of the Dead," of which a perfect copy exists in the Turin Museum; but these are all purely ritualistic, and throw no light upon the present investigation. There are also numerous papyri on scientific, personal, and other subjects, which occasionally serve to correct or confirm a date.

The immense profusion of bass-relief carvings on the walls and pillars of the tombs and temples of Egypt are simply pict-

orial representations of public and private life, such as battles, hunting scenes, manufactures, religious ceremonies, and domestic operations, with accompanying descriptions in hieroglyphics, and contain little or nothing that bears directly on the question at issue. They are largely figured in the splendid tomes of Rosellini, and in several other superb works, and are given in their original colors in the elegant plates of Lepsius and others; a tolerably complete *resumé* of them may be found in the excellent volumes of Wilkinson, and they are described more or less fully in most guide-books, being open to the inspection of all tourists up the Nile. Photographs of such of them as are in positions to admit of being photographed are common, and they are more or less reproduced in nearly every commentary and Bible dictionary.

As to the usefulness of the inscriptions mentioned above—which, when carefully sifted down, are perceived to be not very extensive—it is obvious that, for strictly chronological purposes, they are but little available as independent testimony. In fact, they can hardly be deciphered with certainty, much less understood consistently, without comparison with the records of ancient historians who give the names in more definite form and order. To these latter, therefore, we are compelled at last to turn for a key to these enigmatical and conflicting lists.

II. *The Historical Documents, and their Value.*—These, so far as relates to the proper chronology of Egypt, which, as above seen, depends upon the reigns of the early kings, all resolve themselves, with the exception, perhaps, of the statements of Herodotus, which we will examine separately in the sequel, into the various recensions extant of the *history of Manëtho.* This person is represented by ancient authorities as having been a learned Egyptian priest, of the time of the first or second Ptolemy, who wrote in Greek a poem, unimportant in this connection, and several works on the history of Egypt from the original State records. His own historical writings have utterly perished, except what remain to us in certain extracts from them cited by Josephus, and several abstracts of their contents by early Christian writers.

The fragments preserved by Josephus are two. The first of these is contained in his treatise, "Against Apion," i, 14, 15, and

gives a circumstantial account of the Hycsos or Shepherd-kings, including some chronological items, followed by a detailed list of the kings of Egypt succeeding the expulsion of the Hycsos, with the years and months of each. The second fragment is in the same treatise, (i, 26,) and relates to the exclusion of certain lepers from the land of Egypt; it contains little or no chronological data. Josephus quotes these passages solely for the purpose of controverting them as casting reflections upon the Jews. The period in question evidently embraced the fifteenth to the eighteenth dynasties, the names and years in the first and last of these corresponding tolerably well to those generally recognized. The Shepherd-kings correspond in duration to the sixteenth dynasty, and the seventeenth dynasty is wholly ignored. Unfortunately, it is just here that the Turin Papyrus falls short. The detailed list of kings in the extract of Josephus is chiefly that of the eighteenth dynasty, which is already settled from other sources. His information, therefore, adds little to our stock. It even leaves the chronological position of the Hycsos ambiguous, unless we suppose that the seventeenth dynasty was merely a parallel one.

Of far greater extent and importance are the chronographical excerpts and summaries from Manetho found in the works of Christian fathers from the third to the ninth centuries. First, Julius Africanus, bishop of Nicopolis, in Judea, wrote a history, including a "Canon," or regular list of years, and events in each, from the Creation to his own time, in which he *seems* (from his own account) to have used the dates of Manetho, although it is probable that he derived them from second hands. His own work has perished, except a few fragments; but it appears to have furnished almost if not quite the only source of information respecting the dynastic reigns of Manetho found in later writers, (except Josephus, above,) or now extant.

Secondly, Eusebius, the noted bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, composed a similar work, (*Chronicon*,) including likewise a Canon, founded on that of Africanus. The original Greek of this has (except some fragments and abridgments) likewise perished, but its substance has been preserved in three forms, namely, a translation of the Canon into Latin by St. Jerome, an Armenian version of the whole work discovered in Venice in 1820, and a recension in the Chronology of George Syn-

cellus, a Byzantine monk. Eusebius evidently modified and altered the names, dates, and order of the Egyptian kings to suit his own purposes and the notions of his day, as Africanus doubtless had done before him, and as Syncellus certainly did afterward. The result, of course, is a series of almost inextricable discrepancies and confusions, without any real original copy, or the evidence that any of the writers followed, or even saw, the genuine Manetho. The only wonder is that the least trace of identity is recognizable among them. All that we actually have complete, it will be observed, is the Chronicle of Eusebius. Even the Latin and the Armenian translations of this disagree perpetually with each other and with the Greek, both in the length of particular reigns and in the summaries of the duration of dynasties, and in these two particulars the same list is not consistent with itself. For instance, under the very first name, Menes, (omitting the preliminary mythological reigns,) the Armenian gives 30 years, and the others 62 or 60; to the second king are variously ascribed 57, 59, and 27 years; to the third 31, 39, and 32; yet the Armenian with Syncellus sums up the dynasty as comprising 252 years, and Africanus 253, while the actual total, as in the Latin, is 263, or, more correctly, 233. In the fourth dynasty Eusebius gives 17 kings with an aggregate of 448 years, instead of 8 kings and 284 years, as in other lists. In the fifth dynasty Eusebius (giving 31 kings, instead of 9, yet with a caption stating only 8) inserts 2 by mistake from the sixth dynasty. These are but specimens of what continually occurs throughout the entire series. How is it possible out of such contradictory materials to construct a trustworthy chronology? We can get nothing except by critical conjecture, and balancing probabilities.*

We have promised to consider the list of Herodotus. It is

* "The personal character of Manetho has been made the subject of unbounded eulogy by Bunsen and Lepsius. . . . We must confess that we can see nothing in his existing works which affords any ground for the decision of such a question. Of his historical labors a few isolated fragments only are left; of his chronological work an imperfect list of kings, with the dates of their reigns in inextricable confusion, is all that remains to us. It is from the *fleshless skeleton*, as Lepsius forcibly expresses it, that we have to form our judgment of the symmetry and personal beauty of the man. We must confess our own inability to arrive at so strong a conclusion upon premises so indistinct and shadowy."—Osburn, "Monumental Egypt," vol. i, p. 181.

given in the latter part of book ii of his History, and extends from the foundation of the kingdom to the conquest of Egypt by the Persians. He professes to have derived his information directly from the Egyptian priests. He makes no mention of the dynasties, but classes his first three hundred and forty-one kings as comprising a period (evidently estimated only, and that on the extravagant basis of an average *lifetime* to each reign) of 11,340 years. Of this first series he names but twelve kings, and he gives the years of three only. They begin with Menes and end with Sethos, which two alone are recognizable in the other lists, the last being, probably, Sethi I. Then follow twelve unnamed contemporary kings, and lastly the six well-known kings (in accurate name, order, and generally correct years) who preceded Cambyses, the Persian conqueror of Egypt. Thus we gain no important help from this source for elucidating our subject.

The account of the Egyptian annals in Diodorus Siculus is evidently borrowed, with many changes for the worse, from Herodotus, and is, therefore, of no independent value. The travesties by Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, and the chronographies of Pandorus and Ammianus are apparently little if any more valuable. Even the scanty information contained in these writings, as well as that of "the old Egyptian chronicle," an early work of unknown authorship, only survives to us incorporated in the abstract of Syncellus above referred to. We are shut up to a comparison of the meager, fragmentary and uncertain data of the monuments with the imperfect, discordant and third-hand lists of Manetho. A promising task truly! But let us manfully look it in the face.

Preliminarily, however, we call the reader's special attention to the fact that none of these authorities, whether documentary or monumental, themselves belong to the early period most in dispute; they are not the testimony of contemporaries, but treat of times which they could have known only at second hand. Their comparatively late date is manifest from the point of history to which they come down. Thus Manetho gives the entire series of thirty-one dynasties, ending with the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great: he could not, therefore, have written prior to B. C. 332. The Turin Papyrus includes the fifteenth dynasty; the Tablet of Abydos, the

nineteenth; and the Tablet of Sakkárah, the eighteenth; so that none of them are older than the rule of the Shepherd-kings. The Tablet in the Chamber of Ancestors at Karnak is of the same age. These, be it remembered, are the sole vouchers for the chronology of the previous times. Besides them there is no connected list of the early kings, nor any means of fixing the dates at which they reigned. Some of those kings, it is true, are occasionally, incidentally, and in a fragmentary form, mentioned in isolated inscriptions; but these give no independent data whatever for determining their chronological position. For example, the names of the royal builders of the pyramids at Ghizeh have been discovered carved upon the remains of those structures, but not a lisp of the time when they lived. It is only by comparing these names with those given by Herodotus, and then hunting for them in Manetho's list, that we have any clew to their exact age. We therefore emphatically repeat, that the chronological indications of the monuments, aside from these few authorities named, are all in chasmatic and disconnected items, for constructing which into a system we are absolutely dependent upon lists of comparatively modern date.

With regard to the biblical chronology the case is very different. The patriarchal genealogies, of course, were handed down from father to son; but, mark! they were definitely and carefully preserved in the family, and were not left to be gathered up, as best they might, by remote and detached hands. Moreover, the great longevity of the Hebrew patriarchs required for the transmission of the record but one link (Shem) between the Flood and Abraham, and but two links (Jacob and another of similar length of life) between Abraham and Moses. After this every event was recorded by eye-witnesses and immediate parties to the transactions themselves. The whole was finally made up under the most solemn safeguards of scrupulous veracity. On every principle of external and internal criticism we cannot justly hesitate a moment to prefer the circumstantial, positive, closely connected series of biblical annals to the laconic, vague, and conflicting schemes of Egyptologists.

We advert here, likewise, to another preliminary consideration, which we wish to dispose of separately. The regular annals in both the monumental and the historical accounts are

preceded by certain *mythical eras*. These Manetho (as extant in Eusebius) reports as follows: Reigns of *gods*, (Vulcan, the Sun, Agatho-dæmon, Cronus, Osiris, Typhon, Horus, successively,) in all, 13,900 years; followed by demigods, (heroes,) 1,255 years; again other kings, 1,817 years; then thirty other Memphitic kings, 1,790 years; next ten other Thinitic kings, 350 years; finally, manes and demigods, 5,813 years. All these he sums up as lasting for 11,000 [the real sum of the last five series is 11,025] years, which, he remarks, (evidently his own conjecture,) are merely "lunar, consisting of thirty days each." The Turin Papyrus, in like manner, prefaces the list of human sovereigns by notices of divine rulers; but the document is so greatly injured in this portion that the names and regnal years can only be made out conjecturally. There seems to be space for two hundred and fifty names, of which fragments of one hundred and nineteen alone remain; and the aggregate has been thought to be 23,200 years. The distinction of these into gods, demigods, manes, etc., is ignored. The names of six only can be made out, namely, Seb, Osiris, Seth, Horus, Thoth, Thmei; agreeing but partially with the first seven of Manetho. Herodotus (ii, 144) mentions Horus simply as succeeding Typho, the brother of Osiris, just before the commencement of the human kings. Elsewhere (ii, 43) he arranges the Egyptian gods into three classes, saying that originally there were eight, Pan and Leto being among the number; that from these there were produced twelve, of whom he names only Hercules; and again a third set from the second, whose number he does not specify, to which Dionysius belonged. By modern Egyptologers the Egyptian pantheon has been variously classified, and, in fact, it varied in the different nomes and periods. A very recent writer (Smith, "Chaldæan Account of Genesis," p. 290) has thus ingeniously restored ten of the names preceding that of Menes in the Turin Papyrus, and curiously compared them with the biblical antediluvians and the early Babylonian kings, as reported by Berosus:—

| Egyptian. | Hebrew. | Chaldæan. | Egyptian. | Hebrew. | Chaldæan. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ptha, | Adam, | Alorus. | Set, | Jared, | Daonus. |
| Ra, | Seth, | Alaparus. | Hor, | Enoch, | Ædorachus. |
| Su, | Enos, | Almelon. | Tut, | Methuselah, | Amempsin. |
| Seb, | Cainan, | Ammenon. | Ma, | Lamech, | Otiartes. |
| Hosiri, | Mahalaleel, | Amegalarus. | Hor, | Noah, | Xisuthrus. |

The coincidence is singular, and occasionally there is a slight resemblance in the names and history of each; but otherwise there is little trace of any connection.

The question has been fairly raised, If these lists of gods at the head of Egyptian annals are fabulous, or mythological, what reason have we to attach a superior degree of credibility to the *human* reigns that follow? They certainly do impair our faith in the whole catalogue; but we may, perhaps, safely concede to the advocates of Egyptian chronology that a distinction ought to be made between the dim traditions of the early period, professedly set forth as such, especially if they are but the exaggerated reminiscences of the antediluvian world, like the heroic age of most other ancient nations, and the express and orderly chronicles of a definite monarchy. It is highly edifying, nevertheless, to the lover of the Bible to perceive that the sacred Scriptures appear to furnish the true original of these pagan travesties. One important fact, at least, is tolerably evident from this investigation, namely, that the settled Egyptian history began very shortly after the flood; for that great event is the only natural boundary conceivable between the reigns of the gods and those of men.

III. *The Disagreements, and their probable Causes.*—Before discussing in detail the difficulties involved in a comparison of the monuments and Manetho, it may be well to glance at their correspondences. There is a general coincidence in the classification by means of dynasties, in the substantial identity of most of the names given in both, and in their relative order in the main. In particular they agree in beginning with Menes, (Mena,) succeeded by Athothis, (Tuta,) in introducing Amosis (Aahmes) as marking a new epoch, (after the expulsion of the Hycsos,) and in the more definite annals subsequently, (from the eighteenth dynasty.) These resemblances are sufficient to show a common origin—doubtless authentic State registers—and to establish the genuineness, on the whole, of the extracts from Manetho. But in almost all other respects the two lines diverge, especially in that most cardinal point, the number of the years of the several reigns. We have already indicated, in a general way, these and other important dissimilarities; but a proper estimate of both series of records can be obtained only by a criticism of the details. We, therefore,

bespeak the patience of the reader in following us through a somewhat dry discussion of names and numbers.

*First Dynasty*, (*Thinitic.*)—The first name, written Menes, Mena, or Meni, is agreed upon all hands to have been that of the first mortal king; its coincidence, however, with that of the reputed founder of other kingdoms, (the Lydian Manes, the Phrygian Manis, the Cretan Minos, the Indian Menu, the German Mannus,) has raised the suspicion that he, too, is a mythical character, as his predecessors certainly were. This suspicion is increased by the other circumstances related concerning him, namely, that he reigned 60 or 62 years, and was torn in pieces by a hippopotamus.* Herodotus, of course, makes him the founder of Memphis, and Eusebius attributes to him great military renown. His son and successor, Athothis, Atut, or Tuta, bears marks likewise of being a mythical personage, the Thoth or Æsculapius of the nation. His years, too, are extravagantly long, 57 or 59, (other versions 25 or 27.) His son, named Cencheres, (39, 32 or 31 years,) has no correspondent on the monuments; but the Turin Papyrus has a mutilated name in the third place, which the Tablet of Abydos supplies as Atutu. Manetho's next king, Ouanephes, the son of the preceding, (42 or 23 years,) has nothing in the monumental lists tallying with it, except perhaps Huniba in some detached inscriptions; but the Turin Papyrus again has in its fourth place a mutilated name, of which the last letter seems to be *a*, the full form, Ata, being given in the Tablet of Abydos. The fifth name is Ousaphais or Ousaphaidos, (20 years,) which agrees with the Husapati of the Turin Papyrus and the Tablet of Abydos, and apparently is the Hespti, given in a detached inscription as the fifth king of the *second* dynasty. Were these two dynasties contemporaneous? The sixth name of Manetho is Miebidos or Niebais, (26 years,) corresponding to the Merbat-pu or Merbat-pen of the three monumental lists, the Tab-

* We venture to suggest, also, that the name Adam is Hebrew for this same word, which is no other than our Aryan-English word *man*. And as Menes is Adam, so his illustrious son Athos is no other than Abel. The third name, Kenkenes, is transparently *Cain*. The queer story of Menes being destroyed by a hippopotamus is a blurred edition of Adam's being made mortal by a serpent. Just so in the Assyrian tablet Admi is slain by the sea-monster Tiamat. Very evidently, then, the Egyptian pedigree commences with a traditional patch of antediluvian history transferred to the Nile from the Euphrates.—Ed.

let of Sakkárah beginning at this point. For what reason it ignores the preceding, if they were genuine, does not appear. The seventh name of this dynasty in Manetho is Semempses, or Mempses, (18 years,) in the Turin Papyrus Mensanepher; but in the Tablet of Abydos, Ptah, (apparently only a surname, the proper name being left out,) while the Tablet of Sakkárah has no corresponding name at all in this place. The eighth and last name in Manetho is Bienecches or Oubienthis, (26 years,) where the Turin Papyrus has the fragment ----buhu, the Kebuhu of the two tablets. The sum total of this dynasty in Manetho is, as above stated, 263 [Euseb., 258; Armen., 226] years, by count, but 253 [Euseb., 252] in the heading. We give this dynasty thus in full as a specimen, but brevity will hereafter require us to limit our remarks to the notable discrepancies alone.

*Second Dynasty*, (*Thinitic.*)—Manetho here gives us 9 kings, with an aggregate of 302 (Euseb., 297) years. The Turin Papyrus likewise has 9 names, tolerably agreeing (where legible) with them, but it makes no distinction of a new dynasty till at the end of these, (which is unaccountable, as Manetho makes all the former dynasties succeed regularly from father to son, a fact which he does not subsequently note, apparently taking it for granted in each dynasty,) and it begins the second dynasty with three additional names (mutilated) not given in Manetho or in any other monumental list or inscription. The Tablet of Abydos gives the first five names only, to which the Tablet of Sakkárah adds the seventh. Detached inscriptions afford, apparently, eight still different names interspersed subsequently.

*Third Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—Here Manetho (that is, Africanus) gives 9 (Eusebius, 8) kings, with 214 (Eusebius, 197 or 198) years. The sixth, seventh, and eighth of these are evidently misplaced, as the monuments give them after the first of the next dynasty. On the other hand, the three monumental lists ignore Manetho's second, third, and fourth kings, and the Tablet of Abydos his fifth, also; but they all give in the sixth place one which he wholly omits. The Turin Papyrus gives the years of the three kings in whom all agree as 8, 16 and 19 respectively, where Manetho has 28, 16, (or 20,) and 22 respectively.

*Fourth Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—Here Manetho has 8 (Euse-

bius, 17) names, to which he attributes an aggregate of 284 (Eusebius, 448) years. The eleven best supported, including the three wrongly inserted in the preceding dynasty, would have an aggregate of 322, (Eusebius, 187.) The monuments, however, greatly reduce the long (doubtless associated) reigns, and that of Mencheres, also, should probably be reduced correspondingly, (29, [or 18,] 19, 42, 30, 63, 66, 25, [or 13,] 22, [or 10,] 7, and 9, respectively.) The monumental lists have all these names, with one more between the second and third; but the Tablet of Abydos omits the last three of the dynasty, and inserts an undecipherable name among the three transferred from the third dynasty. The Turin Papyrus gives the years of all these reigns except those corresponding to the fourth and fifth, making an aggregate of 149, (namely, 19, 6, 7, 24, 27, 8, 22, [two blank,] 18, 4, and 2, respectively.)

*Fifth Dynasty*, (*Elephantinitic.*)—This in Manetho contains 9 (the heading erroneously says 8; Eusebius, 31) names, with an aggregate of 218 [or 205] (the heading 248) years, (28, 13, 20, 7, 20, 44, 9, 44, [or 31,] and 33, severally.) The monumental lists have a corresponding number, except the Tablet of Abydos, which omits the third. The Turin Papyrus begins the third subdivision of its second dynasty with the same third name, to which, however, it appends no regnal years. Its aggregate of years for the other 8 is 111, (namely, 7, 12, [blank,] 7, 10, 11, 8, 28, and 30, respectively.)

*Sixth Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—In this Manetho's list contains 6 names, the last a queen, with an aggregate of 203 years, (30, [or 33,] 53, 7, 100, 1, and 12, severally.) The Turin Papyrus, which makes this the first section of its third dynasty, gives also 6 names, all illegible except the last, which, as well as the first, has no years attached; the other four yield an aggregate of 125 years, (20, 14, 40, and 1, respectively.) The Tablet of Abydos gives an additional name between the first and second, and the Tablet of Sakkârah omits the last two names altogether.

*Seventh Dynasty.*—Here a new era and system of designation evidently begin, far less details being given in the lists generally. Manetho (*i. e.*, Africanus, as reported by Syncellus) merely states that this dynasty comprised "70 Memphite kings, who reigned 70 days," (years;) Eusebius: "5 Memphite

kings, who reigned 75 days" (Armen., years.) The Turin Papyrus is the only monumental evidence of their existence;* it gives, as the second section of its third dynasty, 11 names only, (the fourth and the last two illegible,) and appends regnal years to the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth only, with an aggregate of 9 years for these four, (2, 4, 2, and 1, severally.)

*Eighth Dynasty.*—Here Manetho is equally laconic: "28 Memphite kings—146 years;" Eusebius: "5 [Armen., 9] Memphite kings—100 years." The Turin Papyrus has been thought to supply this void by its fourth dynasty, which is in two divisions. The first division has 9 names, the first, second, and sixth illegible; the second division has 5 names, the first and fifth undecipherable, besides space (in the *lacunæ*) apparently for four more at the end. No regnal years are appended to any of the names. The Tablet of Abydos has 16 names, which tolerably correspond.

*Ninth Dynasty.*—Manetho merely gives "19 Heracleopolitan kings—409 years, the first Achthoës;" Eusebius: "Achthoës and 3 successors—100 years." The Turin Papyrus has in its fifth dynasty apparently 6 names, the third and fourth illegible, and no years given. The last two of these correspond with names next given by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, and the first four names are apparently those mentioned in detached inscriptions.

*Tenth Dynasty.*—Manetho has merely "19 Heracleopolitan kings—185 years." The monuments afford no light here.

*Eleventh Dynasty.*—Manetho: "16 Diospolitan kings—43 years; after whom Amemenes—16 years." The later chronographer adds, "altogether 192 kings, 2,300 years," which is

* "The seventh and following dynasties occupy all the second tier, [of the New Tablet of Abydos,] that is, 38 cartouches, including that of Sethos, which ends the list. Of these 38 cartouches, the first immediately follows the sixth dynasty, and the nineteenth belongs to a king, already well known, of the eleventh. From No. 39 to No. 57 are the rows of the 18 kings of the table which are placed between the royal families that I am about to name. But are these 18 kings Memphites, (seventh and eighth dynasties,) or Heracleopolitans (ninth and tenth)? Nobody knows. We, nevertheless, note this fact. On the left and right walls of the passage Phtah is the principal deity. The 130 gods follow him on one side, and the 76 kings follow him on the other. Are we to conclude from this that the royal personages associated in the worship of that god of Memphis are rather Memphite kings? It will be difficult to answer."—Mariette, in the *Revue Archéologique*, ut sup., pp. 16, 17.

evidently only his own summary. The total thus far, however, according to his own list is 202 kings, 2,352 years; according to Eusebius, 129 kings, 2,126 years. The three monumental lists ignore this dynasty altogether, except the last name, to which, however, the Turin Papyrus assigns no years. But we have light from unexpected quarters. Eratosthenes gives us here 9 kings, with an aggregate of 166 years, (22, 12, 8, 18, 7, 12, 11, 60, and [apparently] 16, respectively;) and the Tablet of the Karnak "Hall of Ancestors" mentions three of these and five others earlier.

*Twelfth Dynasty*, (*Diospolitan.*)—Here the full form of designation is resumed, and the monuments are likewise fuller. Manetho gives 7 names (the last a queen) in this dynasty, with an aggregate of 160, (Eusebius, 245,) but by count 182 years, (46, 38, 48, [or 58,] 8, 8, [or 43,] 8, and 4 respectively.) The Turin Papyrus begins its sixth dynasty with the last king of the preceding dynasty, (whom the Tablet of Abydos omits,) but does not give his years; to the remaining 7 reigns it assigns an aggregate of 168 years, (46, 20, 19, 30, 40, [probably in part associate,] 9, and 4, severally.) The Tablet of Abydos omits the last name.

*Thirteenth Dynasty.*—Here Manetho epitomizes again: "60 Diospolitan kings—453 years." They are all ignored by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, but some of them seem to be mentioned in detached inscriptions. The Turin Papyrus, however, is thought to represent them by its seventh dynasty, which it divides into three sections. The first section embraces 21 names, with an aggregate of 106 years assigned to 9 of them; the second has apparently 7 names, with an aggregate of 27 years attributed to 3 of them; and the third section comprehends 32 names; (some illegible,) with an aggregate of 133 appended to 10 of them. As the aggregate number of reigns in these three sections is exactly 60, we may assume that they correctly represent the entire dynasty of Manetho, and that the monumental total of 266 years is correct, instead of his 453.

*Fourteenth Dynasty.*—Manetho is terse again: "76 Xoite kings—184 [Eusebius, 484; Armen., 434] years." Once more the Turin Papyrus, in the absence of all other monumental records of this dynasty, has been thought to come to the rescue,

with its eighth dynasty, which it divides into five sections. The first section includes 21 kings, having 20 years assigned to 11 of them; the second, 24 kings, and 1 year each to 2 of them; the third, 3 names, almost illegible, with no years given; the fourth, 22 names, greatly mutilated, and having no years attached; the fifth, 6 names, much defaced, with no years.

*Fifteenth Dynasty*, (*Shepherd invaders.*)—Here great confusion occurs in the different recensions of Manetho. Syncellus asserts that Eusebius arbitrarily transposed this dynasty into the seventeenth. As this question is complicated by the disputed connection with the Hycsos—a point which is historical rather than chronological, and would lead us, if pursued at this stage, into a tedious side discussion, (see it handled by Dr. Jarvis, in his own way, as above)—we here pass silently over the mooted points of these three dynasties, reserving them for the sequel. Unfortunately, the monumental lists likewise have a break at this point. The Turin Papyrus, however, by the partial coincidence of certain names appended fragmentarily to its eighth dynasty, together with a few correspondences on detached monuments, seems to confirm the order which we here adopt. There are, then, in this dynasty, according to Manetho, 6 (Eusebius, 4) names, with an aggregate of 284 (Josephus, 260; Eusebius, 103) years, (namely, 19, 44, [or 40,] 61, [36,] 50, and 49, [or 30,] and 61, respectively.) The Turin Papyrus appears to assign to the second, third, and fourth of these an aggregate of 110 years, (30, 40, and 60, severally.)

*Sixteenth Dynasty.*—Manetho again is brief: "Other Shepherd-kings—518 years;" some copies, "18 kings—511 [Latin, 318] years;" Euseb., "5 Theban kings—190 years." Most chronologers, however, understand this aggregate to include the fifteenth, and some likewise the seventeenth, dynasty; and this seems to be the meaning of Josephus, (in the passage cited above,) who repeatedly gives the total years as 511. The Turin Papyrus ends with the fifteenth dynasty, and all the other lists appear to ignore these three dynasties entirely, as might be expected if these were foreign usurpers.

*Seventeenth Dynasty.*—Manetho is still brief: "Other Shepherd-kings, and 43 Theban Diospolites; and the Shepherds and Thebans reigned together 151 [some copies, 221; Euseb., 250] years." What relation these two sets of kings held to each

other, whether contemporaneous or successive, is not clear; but the number of years is evidently excessive. The monuments afford no light here.

*Eighteenth Dynasty.*—Here we reach more definite history. Manetho records, "16 [Euseb., 14] Diospolitan kings, of whom the first was Amoses—18 years." Josephus says, "Tethmosis —25 years," and Eusebius has the same number. This king is doubtless the Aahmes of the monuments, where his twenty-second year is recorded. The second king, according to Manetho, (in all his reporters,) was "Chebron [Chebros]—13 years;" and the third, "Amenophthis [Amenophis]—24 [21, or 20½] years." The monuments, however, all give Amenhotp I. as the second king of this dynasty, who evidently corresponds to Manetho's third name. His fourth is, "Amensis—22 years;" Josephus, "Amesis, his sister—21¾ years;" wholly omitted by Eusebius. Manetho's fifth is, "Misaphris—13 years;" Josephus, "Mephres—12¾ years;" Eusebius, "Miphres—12 years." In place of these the monuments all give three of the name of Tautmes successively, namely, Thotmes I., II., and III., who seem to represent Manetho's second, fourth, and fifth names, the queen's reign apparently being merged in the male line. Manetho's sixth name is "Misphragmuthosis—26 years," with which Eusebius and Josephus agree. This is, doubtless, the Amenhotp, or Amenoph II., who appears next in all the monuments. The sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth, as all agree, are respectively Amenoph II.—26 years; Thotmes IV.—9 years; Amenoph III.—31 years, (but the monuments record his thirty-sixth;) and Horus—37 years. The tenth of Manetho is, "Achenes—32 years;" Eusebius, "Acencheres—16 years;" Josephus, "His daughter Acencheres —12 years." The eleventh is, "Rathos—6 years;" Eusebius omits; Josephus, "Her brother Rathotis—9 years." The twelfth is, "Chebres—12 years;" Eusebius, "Cherres—15 years;" Josephus, "Acencheres—12 years, 5 months." The thirteenth is, "Acherres—12 years;" Eusebius omits; Josephus, "Another Acencheres—12 years, 3 months." The fourteenth is, "Aimesses—5 years;" Eusebius, "Armais—5 years;" Josephus, "Armais—4 years, 1 month." All these are ignored by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, but some of them have slight resemblances to names found on detached inscriptions. The internal and external evidence is very doubtful, unless, as Wilkinson

conjectures, they represent the foreigners (not Shepherds) who usurped the throne for an interval at this time, and whose dominion is silently included in the reign of Horus. The fifteenth and sixteenth named in Manetho seem properly to belong to the succeeding dynasty. The first of these, "Rhammeses—1 year;" Eusebius, "Rhamesses—68 years;" Josephus, "Rhamesses—1 year, 4 months," is evidently the Rameses I. of the monuments, who appears to have founded the dynasty, and yet to have reigned but one or two years. The last name is "Amenophath — 19 years;" Eusebius, "Amenophis — 40 years;" Josephus, "Amenophis — 19½ years," doubtless the Menephtah I. of the monuments, which show, however, that he was the fourth in the following dynasty. Josephus has by some strange confusion introduced before him "Armesses Miammoun—60 years, 2 months."

*Nineteenth Dynasty.* — Here Manetho says, "7 [Euseb., 5, but Manetho gives only 6 names] Diospolitan kings." The first is "Sethos [Josephus, Sethosis]—51 [Eusebius, 55; Josephus, 59] years," evidently the Sethi I., given by all the monuments as the successor of Rameses I. The second is, "Rhapsaces [Eusebius, Rhampses; Josephus, Rhamesses]—61 [Euseb. and Joseph., 66] years," the Rameses II. of the monuments. Next should come in the Menephtah I., noticed above, although the Tablet of Abydos omits him. The Tablet of Sakkárah ends with Selthi I. Certain obscure monumental notices appear at this time of a Sethi II. and a Sethi III., but their reigns must have been very short and unimportant. The third of Manetho is "Ammenephthos—20 [Euseb., 40] years," the Menephtah II. of the monuments, also ignored by the Tablet of Abydos. The fourth of Manetho is "Rhamesses—60 years," omitted by Eusebius; the Ramesses III. of the monuments, with whom the Tablet of Sakkárah closes, and whose highest monumental year is his thirty-first. Manetho's fifth and sixth names are, "Ammenemnes—5 [Euseb., 26] years," and "Thuoris—7 years;" of whom the monuments present but slight, if any, traces.

*Twentieth Dynasty.*—Manetho once more becomes laconic: "12 Diospolitan kings—135 [Euseb., 178; Armen., 172] years." The first 8 probably correspond to the Rameses IV. to XI. of the monuments, and the names, and even the existence, of the

rest are uncertain. Their reigns were all unimportant, and apparently of short duration. The first four were sons consecutively of Rameses III. Wilkinson estimates 21 years for their total reigns.

*Twenty-first Dynasty.* — Manetho here says, "7 Tanite kings," and gives them as follows: "Smendes—26 years; Psusennes—46 [Euseb., 41] years; Nephelcheres—4 years; Amenopthis—9 years; Osorchon—6 years; Psinaches—9 years; Psusennes—14 [Euseb., 35] years." Other copies have 6 names only: "Susacin—34; Psuenos—25; Amenophes—9; Nephecheres—6; Saïtes—15; Psinaches—9." These yield a total of 108 to 130 years.

*Twenty-second Dynasty*, (*Bubastites.*)—This opens with Sesonchis, to whom Manetho assigns 21 years. He is the Sheshonk I. of the monuments, which give the twenty-first as his highest year. It was he who, in the fifth year of Rehoboam, (B. C. 969,) invaded Judea, (2 Chron. xii, 2.) This expedition is recorded in Sheshonk's monumental annals, and is thought to have occurred near the close of his reign, as he was for a considerable period contemporary with Solomon. (1 Kings xi, 40.) This gives us the first definite synchronism of Egyptian with biblical chronology. It is a conclusive comment upon the former that, with all its vaunted certainty, we are at last obliged to fall back upon the latter for its verification. Having thus arrived at a positive point in our researches, we need not continue them any farther. We should find the remainder of Manetho's dynasties as defective and untrustworthy as the preceding, and we should meet with about the same lack of data on the monuments for correcting and supplementing them.

Nor must we be deluded into too implicit a reliance upon the monuments themselves. In some instances they are certainly incorrect. For example: a *stela* of Amunemhet II. (Manetho's Amenemes, of the twelfth dynasty) has been found, recording his twenty-eighth year, although the Turin Papyrus gives him only 20 (Manetho, more correctly, 38) years; and still others of his thirty-fifth and forty-fourth years. So of Amunemhet III., of the same line, a *stela* of the forty-fourth year has been found, though the Turin Papyrus gives him but 40 years, (Manetho, again more correctly, 43 in one recension.) There are not

infrequent evidences of the obliteration and corruption of inscriptions by later and hostile kings, as well as of their suppression of a name and reign by their incorporation into those of a more favorite monarch. The omission of many individual names, and even of whole dynasties in one royal list, which nevertheless appear in another, as often noticed above, may have been due to some such cause; but, whatever the motive, the fact greatly abates our confidence in the record for chronological purposes.

The lists of Manetho, on the other hand, while they must ever furnish the basis of Egyptian history, and of chronology likewise, such as it is, must, nevertheless, be admitted by all candid inquirers, in view of the foregoing comparison and analysis, to be very far from the necessary requirements of exact science. Any book-keeper in whose accounts a tithe of such discrepancies should be detected would be summarily dismissed by his employer. An almanac that should rest its calculations upon such a precarious basis would find few purchasers. Ought a chronologer whose dates are made up of such a series of conjectures, balancing of disagreements, and eking out of deficiencies, to be treated with any greater regard? When Egyptologers, under the guise of science, ask us to cast aside the distinct, straightforward, and connected line of biblical chronology for such a mass of *guesses*, we beg to be excused. The demand only exposes an egregious lack of critical capacity.

Some of the causes of this untrustworthy condition of Manetho's numbers are obvious, such as the natural corruption by transmission through other languages and by careless copyists. But this is not sufficient to account for the extent of the contradiction even between the different recensions, much less their wide variance from the monumental records. They must have been *purposely* altered. We have seen that in one instance Syncellus directly charges upon Eusebius a willful change of his authority. The fact appears to be that they all tinkered the chronology to suit their various favorite systems. A modern scholar, who has closely investigated the subject, even insists that the entire scheme of Manetho, at least as it has come down to us, has been fashioned for *cyclical* purposes, and he adduces striking evidences of that view, (Browne, in Arnold's

"Theological Critic," 1851–52.) This we should naturally expect from the temper of the age when the authors lived whose works have alone preserved to us the fragments and compends of Manetho. But, whatever was their purpose, they certainly have so modified and entangled Manetho's numbers that no human ingenuity can now unravel them with certainty. All that learning and research can justly claim is to adjust *conjecturally* their intricacies, errors, and defects.

---

## Art. II.—OUR SOUTHERN FIELD.

The abolition of slavery places the two sections of our country, the North and the South, in much better relations to each other than previously existed. Future peace, harmony, and unity are now possible, and highly probable, in our nation. This change has deeply affected Episcopal Methodism in its different branches, in all sections of the Union, and among both races of our people. If slavery be considered the cause, or the occasion, of the separation of 1844, the conclusion is the same, namely, that this alone divided the Methodist Episcopal Church. Whether it shall be again united in one body or not is for the future to determine; but that all branches of Methodism may continue to live and grow side by side, in peace and fraternal accord, cannot be successfully denied. The precepts of the Gospel require love among brethren. If they be Christians they must be fraternal, though in different organizations.

Methodism spread rapidly in the South at an early day, and in 1844 there was, probably, more of wealth and culture among Methodists in the Southern States than in the same denomination in the North. But since that time the Methodist Episcopal Church has moved forward with marvelous rapidity in the acquisition of wealth, culture, social position, and popular influence, as well as in numbers and usefulness; while the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has not held the foreground which it assumed, and which was granted to it, at the time of its organization. It may be conceded that it has maintained itself strongly in the South, but certainly it has not advanced in these respects so rapidly as the Northern people or as the

Methodist Episcopal Church has done. These are points which should be kept in mind in studying the present status of either Church, or the relations of the two to each other.

Our Southern field, geographically considered, is large, embracing all of the late slave States; for, though a portion of this territory adhered to the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844, and has always been included in that connection, it was, and is now, claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Long-continued efforts have been made to wrest it from us, and we have been compelled to practically, if not nominally, reorganize in nearly all of it since the war. The conferences which originally formed the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were the Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Memphis, Tennessee, Holston, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, with a Church membership of 439,233. The State of Delaware and the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia were embraced in the Philadelphia Conference, a large part of Maryland and Virginia in the Baltimore, and the remainder of Maryland and West Virginia in the Pittsburgh and Ohio Conferences.

The line between the seceding and the adhering conferences in 1844 was as follows: Beginning on the Chesapeake Bay at the mouth of the Rappahannock River; thence up that stream, westward to the Blue Ridge; thence southward along the ridge to a point south of the railroad from Lynchburgh to Bristol, so as to include Salem and Christiansburgh in the Baltimore Conference; thence to the New River, and down that stream to the line now forming the boundary of the State of West Virginia, and across to the Big Sandy on the Kentucky line, and down that river to the Ohio; down the Ohio to the Mississippi, and up the Mississippi to the north line of Missouri, and west along that line to the western boundary of that State. This is the northern line of the Southern Church, conditionally agreed to in the so-called "Plan of Separation," according to the terms of which it had no rights north of this boundary. By that document, however, the Methodist Episcopal Church had a right to claim all societies, stations, and conferences on the border south of this line which should, by a majority vote, decide to adhere to it.

Across this line to the southward the Methodist Episcopal

Church from 1844 to 1848 did not propose to go, unless it was to minister to such societies as voted to adhere to it, as provided in the report of the Committee of Nine. On the contrary, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, using all of the means in its power, proper and improper, passed over this border to the north, and sought to occupy all of the territory in the slave States, and some in the free as well, in the most flagrant violation of the provisions of the report called by the Southern Church the "Plan of Separation," and for which it now professes such ardent love. The Virginia Conference crossed the Chesapeake Bay to the Eastern Shore, and sought to break up societies and circuits in the Philadelphia Conference, also the Rappahannock to the north, and the Blue Ridge to the west, into the Valley of Virginia, in the Baltimore Conference, disaffecting societies and seizing churches without respect to the "border." The Kentucky Conference crossed the line to the east into West Virginia, then in the Ohio Conference, and made most extraordinary efforts to break up our work there, and to drive the Methodist Episcopal Church from the country. Nothing in the history of mankind is more certain than that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, determined to occupy all of the slave territory, and exclude the Methodist Episcopal Church therefrom. It organized a conference in California in 1852, and made a vigorous effort in Kansas in the early settlement of that State, in the expectation that slavery would be established there in violation of a most solemn compact.

The idea of holding all of this slave territory has never been relinquished by the southern Church. In 1861 the Virginia portion of the Baltimore Conference met in Staunton, most of the members from Maryland being absent because of the breaking out of the Rebellion, and, in a kind of outside convention, voted the whole conference, with the membership and Church property, out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, intending to transfer all, in opposition to a majority of the preachers and members, to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at the General Conference to be held in New Orleans in 1862. The General Conference, however, did not meet till 1866. Then this faction, having become an independent Baltimore Conference, united with the southern Church, and

claimed to transfer to that body every thing originally belonging to the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was done with the knowledge, approval, and concurrent action of the New Orleans General Conference, in 1866, since the war, and the territory is still claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It is, therefore, plain that, in considering our southern work, this long-disputed ground should be taken into account. Our southern field, then, extends from Delaware to Mexico, along the old border of freedom from the Atlantic across the Mississippi Valley to the western line of Missouri, down the Atlantic coast to the Florida Keys, and along the Gulf of Mexico to the Rio Grande, embracing sixteen States, nearly one half of all of the organized States of the Union, ten of which are larger than Ohio, and all averaging one third more in area, having an aggregate of 890,972 square miles, with a population of 13,877,612 in 1870.

Financially, the South is poor, and in comparison with the North, very poor. The aggregate wealth of these sixteen States, as given by the census report of 1870, from which these statistics on financial and educational questions are taken, is $5,559,522,132, while that of New York alone is $6,500,841,264, nearly a thousand millions more than the wealth of the entire South. The wealth of Pennsylvania is $3,808,340,112, these two States having nearly twice as much property as all of the South. Over one half of the wealth of the South lies along the old border of freedom, mostly in the States of Missouri, with $1,284,922,897; Kentucky, $604,318,532; Maryland, $643,784,976: total of these States, $2,533,026,425. Ohio has nearly as much wealth as these three put together, namely, $2,235,430,300. Add West Virginia, $190,651,491, and the District of Columbia, $126,873,618, and the aggregate on the border is, $2,850,451,534, over one half of the wealth of the South. Tennessee has $498,237,724. Illinois has $2,121,680,579, nearly as much as all of the cotton, sugar, and rice producing States combined, namely, Virginia, $409,588,133; North Carolina, $260,757,244; South Carolina, $208,146,989; Florida, $44,163,655; Georgia, $268,169,207; Alabama, $201,855,841; Mississippi, $209,197,345; Louisiana, $323,125,666; Texas, $159,052,542; and Arkansas, $156,394,691; aggregating, $2,240,451,313; but little

more, as already observed, than Illinois, or than either Massachusetts or Ohio. Other comparisons fully as striking might be made.

Here is food for reflection. Why this wide difference in the temporal condition of these sections of our common country? Why the poverty of the one and the prosperity of the other? This question has an important bearing upon our southern work. If the South is naturally and necessarily poor, the hope of large returns for our expenditures in this field is not flattering. But there is nothing discouraging for the future in these startling facts. The South need not remain poor. Its resources are abundant. The country is not ruined by the war. By far the greatest financial loss attributed to this cause is by the emancipation of the slaves, which numbered in 1860 3,953,760, and are estimated in the South at a valuation of $4,000,000,000, or over $1,000 each. But this sum is less than two thirds of the valuation of New York, and but little more than that of Pennsylvania. Nor is the poverty of the South due to the soil of this section. Every thing can be raised to advantage here that is produced in the North, and cotton, sugar, and rice, besides. The cotton crop in 1860 amounted to 5,387,052 bales of four hundred pounds each, worth at least ten cents a pound, $215,482,080. Since the war the average product has been greater than before. In the past twelve years, beginning with 1865, 2,000,000 bales more have been raised than during the twelve years preceding 1861, and much more than at any other time previous. In that year, 1860, 187,167,032 pounds of rice and 230,982 hogsheads of sugar were produced on southern plantations. The rice and sugar interests have not recovered their former proportions for manifest reasons. In the matter of raising home supplies there has been great improvement in later years in most of the States, and there is no room for doubt that if our laboring force, white and colored, were stimulated to reasonable activity by a hope of fair compensation, all necessary provisions for the plantation could be raised, and as much rice and sugar annually as in 1860, and seven or eight millions of bales of cotton in addition. The time is not distant when even greater results than these may be realized by improvement of the soil, better methods of cultivation, and more intelligent and increased in-

dustry, if justice be done and peace maintained. Add to these the products of the mines, with which the country abounds, and of manufactures, which are rapidly increasing, and it is seen that the resources of the South are almost without limit. Perhaps there is no country on the globe of equal extent having greater natural advantages. The climate is mild, and yet remarkably healthful, affording the best possible opportunities to the husbandman and other laborers. The hills of the center and plains of the coast in future ages will teem with tens of millions of people. The whites are of Saxon blood, and if they differ materially from the population of the North, it is because they have been placed in different circumstances.

Why, then, the poverty of the South? Slavery is the cause. This institution turned European immigration, the best the world ever produced for peopling a new country, largely from the South to the North, and also drove thousands of our best native population across the Ohio River and to the West, to escape its baneful influence. Immigration brought to the North, year by year, brain, muscle, and money to aid in developing the country, while the South wastefully and wickedly poured out its millions to purchase men to till its lands and build its cities. When a slave died the money invested in him was lost; and thus every generation sunk and annihilated hundreds, and in late years thousands of millions of dollars, which, under free institutions, would have gone into improvements, and helped to swell the wealth of the nation. The free immigration of the North and the purchase of laborers for the South go far toward solving the question under discussion. Again, slavery was degrading, necessarily so, and the idea of this degradation inevitably passed from the slave to all branches of manual labor. Work was shunned because workmen were despised. Instead of promoting industry, slavery was its greatest enemy and hinderance, for, while it overtaxed the bondman, it discouraged, depressed, and almost destroyed free labor; and as two thirds of the population were free, the loss during the last hundred years through the inactivity of large numbers of white people has been immense. The slave system, also, impoverished the lands. In all civilized countries, the South alone excepted, the older the country the more valuable the soil. Not so here. A few years of cultivation, not

enough even to bring it into good tilth under the old system, left the surface exhausted and wasted, and, for the want of better culture, large tracts were thrown out as waste and worthless. Slavery has made the South poor, and not a barren soil, an unfavorable climate, or an indolent and improvident people. A century of freedom, peace, and enterprise, directed by intelligence, will make the South the pride of America, the admired of all lands, the garden of the world. The ministers and teachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church are not toiling in vain in these States.

The educational condition of the South is deplorable, and always has been. It has its statesmen, scholars, literary men and women, of whom it may be proud, but the mass of the people have been left, by them and by the Churches, in ignorance. The slaves were prevented from learning by design; had they been educated they would have found a way out of bondage. To hold them in slavery it was necessary to keep them in darkness. For this reason it was made a crime, punishable by law, in most of the States, to teach a slave a knowledge of letters. The poor white people were permitted to remain in a similar condition for a like purpose, to protect the peculiar institution. There were always in the South thousands who regarded slavery as an evil, and who thought it a Christian duty to instruct the ignorant; and if schools had been established for the benefit of the white people generally the colored would have found friends among them who would have taught them to read in disregard of the law, and thus slavery would have been undermined. For the same reason manufacturing was but little encouraged in the South before the war. Profits were as much desired then as now, and abundant openings might have been found for various enterprises of that kind; but manufacturing called for skilled laborers, and these would have demanded schools, and education would have endangered slavery, and this was sustained and guarded at all hazards. An ignorant people might be controlled by a designing aristocracy, but an enlightened community would become independent, or, at least, restive, under self-constituted leaders. Slavery kept the South in ignorance.

One half of the adult population of the South in 1870 was illiterate. At that time there were 5,658,144 persons in the

United States, over ten years of age, who could not write: 4,880,271 were native-born, and 4,091,089 of these were in the South, leaving only 1,567,055 illiterates in the North, most of whom were foreigners, or of foreign descent. For example: Massachusetts had 97,742 illiterates over ten years of age, 89,830 of whom were foreign-born, and of the remaining 7,912 one half were born of foreign parents, less than 4,000 in a native white population of 1,090,085, or one in 270; while Alabama had 91,219 native white adults who could not write, in a native white population of 511,520, or one in 5½, Georgia had 110,849 native white adults in the same condition, in a native white population of 627,799, or one in 5½, and North Carolina 166,280 in a native white population of 675,442, or one in 4. Virginia had 445,897 illiterates, or 57 per cent. of the population, over ten years of age; North Carolina, 397,690, or 51 per cent.; South Carolina, 290,374, or 57 per cent.; Florida, 71,803, or 54 per ct.; Georgia, 468,593, or 56 per ct.; Alabama, 383,012, or 54 per ct.; Mississippi, 313,310, or 53 per cent.; Louisiana, 276,158, or 52 per cent.; the number of illiterates in the entire South, over ten years old, white and colored, native and foreign, being 4,161,203, which is nearly one half of the population of that age, and fully one half of those over fifteen years. But these figures do not tell the whole truth touching this matter. There is yet a darker shade to this sad and humiliating picture. It is this: thousands may spell out words and write their names, and thus be classed with those who read and write, who cannot peruse a newspaper or the Bible intelligently. This is particularly true where the standard of learning is so low as in the South, and where illiteracy is not discreditable. It is painful to make the admission, but it is, nevertheless, true, as is apparent from the foregoing facts, that, deductions being made for children, these statistics will show that in some of the Southern States not one half of the native white population can read the word of God so as to readily apprehend its meaning. Twelve thousand white families in Alabama are destitute of the Bible. This is the fruit of slavery.

The South has numerous Churches, orthodox and evangelical in belief. The Baptist Year-Book for 1876 gives the number of that order in the South at 1,269,388, of whom the colored Baptists claim 600,000, but of these candor extorts the

remark that they are greatly lacking in organization, intelligence, and morals. The Southern Presbyterian Church, according to the latest statistics, has 112,000 communicants; the Cumberland Presbyterian about the same, though only 100,000 in the South; the Lutherans possibly as many, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has 67,928 in the Southern States, according to the Church Almanac of 1878. The Congregationalists have a number of organizations formed since the war, and are accomplishing much good, especially through the schools of the American Missionary Association. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has 715,951 white members; 2,083 colored members; 4,315 Indians; 3,271 traveling, 259 superannuated, and 5,462 local preachers; total, 731,361. In 1844 it organized with 439,233 members and 1,251 preachers; total, 440,484; and in a short time wrested several thousand more from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1860 it had 749,068 members, and 2,884 preachers; total, 751,952; loss in sixteen years, from 1860 to 1876, 20,591. It had in 1860 175,252 colored members, and has now but 2,083. The gain in white members and preachers during these sixteen years has been 148,243, an average of 9,265 a year. The African Methodist Episcopal Church has, perhaps, 180,000; the Zion Methodist Episcopal Church, 120,000; and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America, 80,000 in the South, though the last three are, doubtless, over-estimated. Allow to the Methodist Protestant 50,000. All other evangelical Churches in the South are small in numbers and feeble in influence except the Methodist Episcopal Church. Giving these denominations all they claim by the largest reasonable estimates, there are not over 2,800,000 nominal communicants in Protestant Churches, not including our own, in the South. Supposing two additional adherents, for small children and outside friends, to one member, as many as facts will justify, they embrace only 8,400,000 in a population of 13,877,612, leaving five and a half millions without the Gospel, except as they receive it at the hand of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This is as good showing for the South as can be reasonably made. The practical work and efficiency of a Church is in part indicated by its Sunday-schools. Tried by this standard the condition of the South is appalling. The million and a quarter

of Baptists only claim to have 220,000 in Sunday-schools. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has 346,759; these two leading denominations, with two millions of members, having but a trifle over half a million in their Sunday-schools. Outside of the Methodist Episcopal Church there are not a million persons even enrolled in Protestant Sunday-schools in the South, not an average of one in thirteen of the population. It is evident that there is ample room for the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South in addition to all the other Protestant forces in this section.

The Churches of the South, as a whole, are lacking in moral strength. The people are generally orthodox in sentiment, believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the atonement, and in salvation from sin by faith in Christ alone. There is less skepticism in the public mind in the South than in the North. The first table of the law touching man's relations and obligations to God has been well maintained by the religious press and the pulpit, but the Bible view of man's duty to man has been greatly overlooked by both ministers and Churches. The morality of the Gospel has been sadly neglected in precept and practice. The pulpit has been orthodox in its teaching of the theory of religion, so far as it has gone, but weak in enforcing the divine precepts touching practical questions of right and wrong.

The colored people, especially, need our assistance. They number five millions, most of whom are children of want, who have been providentially placed at our doors. They were brought to this country when in the ignorance, poverty, and wretchedness of barbarism, and here they have been held in the lowest relation known to mankind—slavery. When liberated, they were without preparation for freedom, without education, without lands, without homes, without families, without bread for a day, or clothing to cover their nakedness. Since emancipation, they have been preyed upon by the avaricious, and led astray by the corrupt. Like the man on the way from Jerusalem to Jericho, they have fallen among thieves, been waylaid, beaten, and left bleeding and half dead, while scarcely a Samaritan hand has been extended to bind up their wounds or alleviate their distresses. And yet they have kept the peace and struggled upward. They are

rising to manhood, and cultivating a better social and Christian life. That they have done so well is the wonder of our times. God is with them; he pities them, and will care for them. For the Church to cast them off would be folly and sin. Of this there is no thought, but to help them to help themselves should be the aim and ambition of every Christian and philanthropist in the land. There are also thousands of whites as much neglected by the more favored classes as these, and whose condition calls for as deep sympathy and active co-operation. Surely no one will say that there is no need of this, or any other branch of the Church which is able to lend a hand in aid of these lowly and unfortunate classes.

The welfare of the country requires that all of these be taught in the duties of Christian citizenship in a free country. They vote, and otherwise take part in the affairs of State. Upon their action may depend the most momentous results. If intelligent, they may act independently and wisely; if ignorant, they may fall a prey to demagogues, and, by misapprehension of duty, bring shame and ruin upon the country. They will be a source of danger or of security; they will add strength or weakness to the nation as they are enlightened or neglected. There is more to be feared from the five and a half millions of illiterate citizens of the United States than from any other equal number of our people, because of the ease with which they may be misled in times of peril. The vicious are always suspected and watched, but an ignorant population may, at any time, prove a broken reed, piercing the hand that leans upon it. Important events in our history, well calculated to arouse the thoughtless and to alarm even the most hopeful, have only been made possible by the ignorance of the multitudes. Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people; but there is little hope for better morals without more intelligence among the masses. In our country the people are sovereign, and an ignorant and corrupt ruler is a public calamity. Shall not the strongest Church in America continue to do something in the darkest corner of our land for its future safety and well being?

The General Conference of 1848 determined to reoccupy the South, as Providence should open the way. The error of 1844 was acknowledged, and as the Southern Church had vio-

lated the conditions of the arrangement on which it professedly based its organization as a separate body, that enactment, even had it otherwise been valid, was annulled, and the Methodist Episcopal Church felt free to enter southern territory wherever an opportunity was found. The West Virginia and Missouri Conferences were formed during that year, afterward the Kentucky and the Arkansas. But such was the bitterness of the pro-slavery spirit that but little progress was made before the war, and the work was greatly distracted, and in many places broken up, in the early years of the Rebellion, so that in 1862 the Minutes reported only 4,940 members on the territory that seceded in 1844. Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia were also thrown into confusion. More than two hundred churches, of which we had peaceable possession from the time they were built, and to which the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had not a shadow of title, were seized, and every thing was done that was possible to force the Methodist Episcopal Church out of all the States where slavery was tolerated. Had the Rebellion succeeded, this would have been done. But as the armies of the Union advanced southward the people, white and colored, called for the ministry of the Church of their fathers. It spread from State to State, and has been reorganized in all parts of the South.

On the slave territory of 1860 the Methodist Episcopal Church now has 27 annual conferences, 400,000 Church members, 2,103 traveling and 4,030 local preachers, 223,254 Sunday-school scholars, 34,890 teachers, over nine millions of dollars in Church property, numerous institutions of learning, and every thing requisite to the development of a strong and growing Church. The work has been marvelous in the rapidity and healthfulness of its growth, and the readiness with which it has been consolidated and unified into a homogeneous and aggressive body. This is the more extraordinary from the fact that it is made up, almost exactly, of equal numbers of white and colored people. Had any one predicted ten years ago that the results now accomplished would have been realized at this time, he would have been thought an enthusiast. But these numbers have not been gathered by means of a time-serving policy in lowering the standard of morals to suit circumstances or the inclinations of the worldly, or by

yielding to prejudice against the National Government, or the people of the North, but by faithful Christian work. Methodism never had more fearless defenders of its faith and principles than in this field. They are outspoken in behalf of national unity, the rights of man, and equality before the law and in the Christian Church, and also on the evils of intemperance, social corruption, the desecration of the Sabbath, and all others which afflict mankind and threaten the welfare of the country, as is no other pulpit in the South. They are universally in favor of the education of all classes, and of Christian unity, peace, and fraternal love among all evangelical Churches.

The two hundred thousand white members in this field are found mostly along the border in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, where, in many places they constitute by far the strongest denomination in the section, and form a base to our Southern work of the most reliable and favorable character. The influence of the Churches in Baltimore, Washington, Covington, Louisville, and St. Louis, is felt throughout the South. South of these States the white work is not so strong, but it is aggressive and full of hope. The Central Tennessee Conference is composed of this class, the white, as is most of the Holston; also the Georgia, the Alabama, the Austin Conference in Texas, and the Southern German Conference. There is, also, a considerable sprinkling of white members in the Carolinas, Florida, and Louisiana. The educational work has not been forgotten by these members. With but little aid from the North, they have established the East Tennessee Wesleyan University, Tullahoma College, Central Tennessee Conference Seminary, Dixon Seminary, Holston Seminary, in Tennessee; Candler College, in North Carolina; Ellijay Seminary, in Georgia; and Andrews Institute, in Alabama; all of which are doing excellent service in their several locations and spheres. Their ministers, on an average, are fully equal to those of other denominations in like circumstances, and in intelligence and social position the membership has reason for gratitude, and compares favorably with other Churches.

If possible, the work among the colored people is still more remarkable. They number, also, two hundred thousand mem-

bers, and are well organized throughout the South. Assisted by the Freedmen's Aid Society, schools of high grade are established among them at Nashville, Atlanta, Orangeburgh, Jacksonville, Huntsville, Holly Springs, New Orleans, and in Texas, and seminaries at Dadeville, La Grange, Waynesborough, and Greensborough, a theological institute in Baltimore, and local schools at numerous other places. From these not less than a thousand young men and women are now going forth annually to teach in the public schools among their people, having not less than fifty thousand students under their instruction. What a work is this to spring as from the dust in so short a time! A few years more, and it will reach the millions. The Methodist Episcopal Church is the strongest moral force among this people. They are girding themselves for the final conflict with Satan, for the mastery of the globe. All of the appliances of the Church have been brought into requisition in the prosecution of the Southern mission. The itinerancy, episcopal supervision, the Missionary Society, Board of Church Extension, Sunday-School Union, Book Concern, Board of Education, and Tract Society, have all been permitted to share in the burdens, and will reap of the harvests in this field.

Some in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have recently, in the papers of that denomination, urged the importance of requiring the Methodist Episcopal Church to withdraw from the South, disbanding its forces here, or turning them over to other organizations, as the price of the fraternal favor of that body. Such a preposterous suggestion cannot be entertained for a moment. The Providence which placed us there has yet a greater work for us in reserve. The idea that two friendly branches of the Church of Christ cannot abide peaceably in the same section of country is absurd. God has given to these missions such success as seldom, if ever, attended his ministers in the same time under like circumstances, and to leave the vineyard now would be a crime of fearful magnitude. At the time of the division the Methodist Episcopal Church had left to it 632,123 members. It has advanced to the number of 1,673,287 members, and 23,839 preachers; total, 1,697,126; increase, one million; teachers and scholars in Sunday-school, 1,706,557; and it raised for benevolence and Church

expenses in 1877, $16,597,850. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, starting at the same time—to repeat in this connection—with 439,233 members, now has 722,346 in its laity; increase, 283,113; 8,992 preachers, 396,556 teachers and scholars in Sunday-school. In view of this record, and of the achievements in the Southern field by the Methodist Episcopal Church, why should it be asked to leave the South, or relax its efforts in this portion of the country? At this time it has in the South nearly two thirds as many members and Sunday-school scholars, over two thirds as many Sunday-school teachers and preachers, as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in all its borders, including the North and the Pacific coast; and it pays into the missionary treasury at least two thirds as much as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, raises for missions, and three times more than that body expends in foreign lands; and it is building more churches than that or any other denomination in the same section.

When it organized in the North, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, must have expected either to overrun the whole country, and constitute the main body of Episcopal Methodism, or that the Methodist Episcopal Church would claim equal rights in the South. It struggled for the mastery in California and Kansas, as already observed, in the early history of those States; and in 1862, Dr. Ditzler, of that denomination, was found in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, endeavoring to unite the enemies of the Government, of Methodist belief, in a body known as the Christian Union, afterward called the Episcopal Methodist Church. Dr. Ditzler appeared at the General Conference in New Orleans, in 1866, with glowing accounts of this movement, claiming four or five thousand members, sixty traveling preachers, and gaining by fifties daily. The Bishops approved of the measure, and commended it in their address, and the General Conference ingrafted it upon the Church, as was originally designed. But now, after the labors of fourteen years, it numbers only 52 traveling, 81 local ministers, and 5,792 members, scattered over the Northwest. The other Conferences of the Southern Church on free territory are still weaker. Within the Denver Annual Conference there are only 21 ministers in all, and 502 members; Los Angelos Conference, 19 traveling ministers, 17 local, and

875 members; Pacific Conference, 59 traveling, 52 local preachers, and 3,728 members; Columbia Conference, 20 traveling, 23 local preachers, and 1,033 members; total of ministers and members, 12,282, and these are distributed from Ohio to the Pacific Ocean. If these persons think that they can be more pious or useful in that communion, it is their right to remain there, and they should do so. Certain it is that hundreds of thousands in the South believe that they can be both more pious and useful in the Methodist Episcopal Church than in any other. Who shall deny them the privilege?

If the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, conditions her withdrawal from the North upon the consent of our Church to divide itself by geographical lines, or to retire from the South, the disinterested love of our Southern brethren in such a proposal is not apparent. That would be a proposition to us to give a well-organized Church of four hundred thousand members and over nine millions of dollars in Church property for these few broken fragments. And if such a measure were possible, neither Church would realize much advantage from it, for the reason that the people are free to choose their Church relations, and but few of our members would, or could consistently, unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and that has but a very small number to join the Methodist Episcopal Church. Nearly half a million of citizens in the South claim the right to be members of our Methodist Episcopal Church; and the sacred cause of religious liberty on American soil is at stake in their case. Only by the most ruthless persecuting violence, whether by popular mobs or by Government despotism, can the rights of such a body of American Christians be destroyed. Besides, terms of "formal" fraternity have been agreed to, which leave each Church free to occupy the whole country untrammeled by the other. The Brooklyn General Conference, in offering fraternal courtesies to the Southern Church, in 1872, stated explicitly that the Methodist Episcopal Church would continue to sustain its work in the South.* The General Conference in Louisville

* Our Church is as really settled in that region as in any part of the land; and every consideration of good faith to our own people, and of regard to the integrity of our Church, and especially of the unmistakable evidences of the favor of God toward our efforts there, forbids the thought of relaxing our labors in that part of

accepted the fraternal delegates sent to it on this condition, and appointed commissioners to arrange terms of "formal" fraternity. An effort in the General Conference to instruct the commissioners failed, and they were left without direction to act on behalf of the Church. Conditions were agreed to which have been almost unanimously approved by the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and which do not limit the territory of either body, but permit each to go forth every-where with the approval of the other. Why draw a geographical line between them now?

Some have suggested that these Southern missions are expensive and burdensome to the Church. The support of the Gospel requires money in all places, and the benevolent have been called upon to aid the needy from the time of the apostles. Christian missions are always considered burdensome by a portion of the Church, whether in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Germany, Italy, India, China, or elsewhere. Shall they, for this reason, be abandoned? If not in those places, why here? These are not more onerous than others. Baltimore and Wilmington Conferences are on slave territory, but they received no appropriations from the missionary treasury in 1876, though they paid to it $37,582. Not taking these into account, we have 740 ministers among the white people of the South, who received from the missionary treasury, in 1876, $29,300, but they paid into the treasury, from collections raised among the people to whom they preached, $10,418, leaving only $18,882 drawn from the Church outside of these Conferences for the support of all our white work in the South for that year, being an average of $25 50 to each preacher. This year they receive less, and will probably raise more missionary money. During the same year there were given to Mexico, $24,000; Japan, $18,000; Italy, $19,200; Germany, $24,000; Scandinavia, $45,600; China, $33,900; and to India, $66,000. None too much in any case,

our work. We must, therefore, continue to occupy that part of the country in perpetuity: and we have need to strengthen and reinforce our work in it, as God shall give us the means and the opportunities. But in all this we desire to avoid all unfriendly rivalries with our brethren of the Church, South. There is abundant room for both us and them, and God may use both of these Churches for the promotion of his cause in those parts.—*Jour., Gen. Conf.*, 1872, pp. 402, 403.

and, doubtless, all of this money was well used; but in comparison with these fields our white work in the South cannot be considered burdensome or expensive. When the whole of the slave territory is included, it is found that the white members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South paid into the missionary treasury of the Church in 1876 $18,700 *more* than was drawn from it for the support of all of our white work in the South for the same year!

The number of preachers among the colored people in 1876 was 1,028, who received in that year $58,500 of missionary money; but they raised from those whom they served, and paid into the treasury, during the same year, $7,937; balance, $50,563; average per minister paid by the Church outside of these conferences, $49. It may be well in this connection to make further comparisons with the Southern Church. It has but one benevolent collection, that is, for missions, and reports no other in the Minutes, except for superannuated preachers. This year it has appropriated for missions, including Church extension, $78,000; namely, for China, $14,250; Mexico, $3,381; Brazil, $1,850; total for foreign missions, $19,481. The remainder is appropriated, some conditionally, some for church building, and the balance to domestic missions. The custom of that denomination has been to require a considerable portion of the appropriations to home missions to be raised on the charges receiving the appropriations, for the support of the ministers on those circuits; that is, a part of the appropriation was not paid unless the money was collected on the circuits receiving it for that purpose. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the South raised for missions, aside from all the other collections, in 1876, $55,937, and in 1877, $57,626, and on the territory that seceded in 1844, $14,186, in 1876, and $16,381, in 1877, which is almost as much as the Church, South, gives to foreign fields. Our people have raised this money in the midst of poverty, opposition, persecution, and bloodshed, of which the North has no conception, and while struggling heroically to build houses of worship, and to support the ministry. Did they enjoy the privileges granted to others, in all parts of the South, these collections would exceed the best efforts of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and if the North were to give for benevolent purposes, of its

ability, according to circumstances, as liberally as these have done, the treasuries of the Church would be overflowing. Again, let it be remembered that for every dollar contributed to this field there are now two dollars in Church property in the conferences on the territory that seceded in 1844.

Such are some of the facts in relation to our Southern field. The statements here given are not overdrawn, but based upon the most reliable authorities. The relative strength of our work is greater, rather than under these representations, for the palpable reasons that the administration of discipline is more strict, and the statistics are much more reliable, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, than in the Baptist, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or either of the African Methodist branches. If their reports of Church members were made as carefully as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, great reductions in numbers would follow, and if members were excluded for misdemeanors, as is expected among us, still further and serious losses would result to those denominations. If the strength of any Church is here underestimated, it is that of our own. The evidence is conclusive that the field is wide and also ripe.

And we repeat that our strength in the South enhances and sustains the strength of every other evangelical influence. Every other evangelical Church is not the weaker, but the stronger for our presence. We come not to destroy, but to build up. We are ready to harmonize and to co-operate with every Protestant Christian body that seeks the spread of Christian holiness. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, may and ought to gather new strength, power, numbers, and prosperity, in brotherhood with us. We offer it not only the fraternal, but the co-operative hand; but whether it accepts or rejects it, our duty and our work are the same. We exist here not by its sufferance. We do not ask its permission. We are Americans, and have a right every-where in our free America. The Church has the same right in the North that we have; we have the same right in the South that it has. And there are so many ties of common history, doctrine, and spirit, that we ought to welcome each other with heart and hand as common workers in the same great field.

What has been done is only the beginning of better things. The design in the Divine mind for America, and for the

world, is manifest, to wit: that the whole earth become the garden of the Lord, filled with righteousness, peace, love, intelligence, joy, and material prosperity. The immediate future of our country to many appears dark and portentous. None but the Divine eye can see what is before us, but He who has watched over our earlier years is still with his people, and will never fail them. It may prove that the defenders of the Union, after having preserved the nation from disruption and ruin, untimely surrendered to opposing principles, and that other struggles are inevitable. But eternity and almightiness are attributes of right, and through the mercy of God the end will be glorious. In any case, a great and effectual door is open before the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, and fearful responsibility attaches to its course in reference to this section. Faithful to its high calling, to its principles, to itself, and, including all, to God, its sowing in tears will be followed by reaping with joy.

---

## Art. III.—SILENCE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCHES.

*The Silence of Women in the Churches.* By Rev. A. Hastings Ross, Springfield, Ohio. Articles in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," April and October, 1870.

*Women keeping Silence in Churches.* By Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D., Andover, Mass. Article in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1878.

*Woman Preaching Forbidden by Scripture.* By Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D. Contribution to the "New York Independent."

*Shall Women Preach in the Congregation?* By Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D.D. Contribution to the "New York Independent."

*Female Preaching.* Anon. Copy of a letter sent to an absent daughter.

The ideal woman represented in the New Testament is a subject forever beautiful to our thoughts. It is a picture that ever attracts and never wearies in the study. To its contemplation the Christian student turns with an interest that is at once instructive and tireless. Masters of æsthetic art have made themselves immortal by illustrating their own conceptions in Madonnas on canvas and marble; but paintings and statuary never did, and never can, successfully represent the womanhood of the Scriptures. Genius cannot reproduce it in objective forms. It is a thought that cannot be thoroughly

transferred by chisel or brush. Its realization, therefore, must either remain forever subjective as the creation of our own minds, or become exampled in the feminine character molded into the saintly life.

Woman's relations unfold suggestively and significantly to human intelligence. Her history illustrates the strangest combination of abilities and disabilities of character, along with immeasurable susceptibilities and possibilities of being. Before God and man she stands at once in the attitude of affection and silence. Her position of seeming equality with her husband in the original plan and appointment of God; her subsequent subordination, consequent upon the commission of her first sin; her beautiful acceptance of subjection, as imposed in the Divine ruling; her peculiar responsibilities of life, putting in utmost request her loving heart; her womanly qualifications, discoverable in every attribute of her nature; her worth and wealth of love, developed under the severer disciplines of probation; her capabilities of character, disclosed through her intuitions and faith—these are among the things constituting the *memorabilia* of a Christian woman's life.

Whatever nature may unfold touching her position and government in the home, it is yet indispensable to look to the Scriptures to discover any restrictions imposed upon female character or activities in the services of the Church. Strange to say, her attitude in her relation to her husband and her behavior in the sanctuary of God, while the subject of special direction from the apostle, are yet points not quite settled in the sincere convictions of the Christian scholar and critic. Opinions divide and oppose precisely where we should naturally expect a conclusion reached so complete in our understanding as to place the matter beyond all question or recall.

It is not proposed to discuss in this paper the claims of the modern "woman movement" as related to her right of franchise or the demand made that she should be recognized as an ordained minister of Christ. These questions differ from that here contemplated. Rather, it is the purpose to examine the teachings of Scripture—aside from preconceived theory—touching woman's right of speech under the apostle's ruling, or whether she is in fact relegated to a condition of *absolute silence* whenever she engages in the services of the sanctuary.

Two paragraphs from the pen of Paul are relied upon as fundamental to the two opposing theories, each of which claims to represent the doctrine of woman's true position on the question of silence and subordination, as set forth in the New Testament: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." 1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35. "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. ii, 11–14.

If woman was subordinated to man from the moment of her creation, she certainly does not seem to have been subjected to his "rule"* before the fall. Rather, Adam appears to recognize entire equality as existing between himself and Eve when, with an expressed and special reason, he applies to her the very name designating the man, with merely an added sign of feminine gender: אִישׁ, *man*, אִשָּׁה, *woman*. (Gen. ii, 23.) Her name, therefore, is the more significant, because intended to express character and relation. Nevertheless, Paul predicates man's pre-eminence over the woman on both natural and moral grounds—on the priority of man's creation and on the priority of woman's sin. It is not important to this argument whether the order of creation was an after-thought with Paul, and not a part of the original plan intending to indicate superiority by priority, or whether, so intended, the design is simply not recorded in the Genesis of Scripture. It may, therefore, be assumed here as an accepted fact, generally, that man is placed in unquestionable pre-eminence over the woman, in some sense, in the order of God's pleasure, in the order of human creation, in the order of physical prowess, in the order of society at large, in the order of the family at home: not because man is more highly endowed with intellectual powers, for this may be so or not in a given case; not because his soul-nature is more sensitively alive to God's will, for that is not usually apparent in Christian assemblies; not because he sus-

* "He shall rule over thee." Gen. iii, 16.

tains a more responsible relation as a parent, for this would certainly be called in question by the thoughtful; but simply, and so far as appears in the Scriptures, on the ground that man was the first created, and woman was the first in sin; and for the further reason that, in the creative work, woman is at two removes from God and at one remove from man, in the sense that man was created *by* God and *for* God, to represent his image and glory, while woman was created *from* man and *for* man, and so represents man's glory. "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man, . . . forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." 1 Cor. xi, 3, 7, 9. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. ii, 10–14.

The pre-eminence of man and the subordination of woman are the two things taught, constituting one fact, in this paragraph. Churchly assemblies are not mentioned in this connection, but it is presumable that this special provision was intended to govern her conduct in public. For while woman is directly prohibited from exercising the office of *teacher* in the Church—whatever that may especially import—she seems to have exercised this "gift" as a usual and unquestioned prerogative *in private*. The co-laborers of Paul at Ephesus, left in authority by him and charged with the supervision of the churchly interests there, furnish an illustrative instance. Aquila, of Alexandria, and Priscilla, his wife, having listened carefully in the synagogue to Apollos, himself "an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures," who, "being fervent in the spirit, taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John, . . . *they* (*plural*, προσελάβοντο,) *took him unto them, and* (*plural*, ἐξέθεντο,) *expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly*." Acts xviii, 25, 26. This circumstance of *private teaching* by a gifted woman is related as if it was neither uncommon nor disapproved in the understanding of the primitive Church.

Exactly what the function of *teacher* was, in distinction

from that of prophet, we are not informed in the New Testament. Paul enumerates three different kinds of public instructors as regular, besides the miscellaneous "gifts;" and the *apostles* (ἀπόστολοι) always appear as first in the order of rank, the *prophets* (προφῆται) as second, and usually the *teachers* (διδάσκαλοι) as third. "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles. . . . Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?" 1 Cor. xii, 28, 29. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. iv, 11, 12. That a broad distinction did exist in these branches of the Christian service is, then, a matter of fact; although an *apostle* at times could and did exercise the specific "gifts" of most, if not all, of those enumerated in the catalogue.*

Why, then, women were divinely appointed to the superior office of prophetess, but were divinely denied the inferior one of teacher, we are not told by the apostles. The fact itself, however, is self-apparent. † In the silence of Scripture we are left very much to the conclusions of reason. The appellatives, διδάσκαλος, *teacher*, and μάθητής, *learner*, are correlatives. Scholars regard the teacher as the equivalent of κατηχητής, a *catechist-teacher*, "according to the ancient way of teaching, where the teacher dictated, and the pupil repeated."‡ Biblicists consider the teacher of the New Testament as corresponding with ῥαββί, *rabbi*, in the Jewish Church, § a position indicating at once superiority and authority of human origin and character, with large privileges of instruction, interpretation, and dictation. "Διδάσκαλοι appear as having a special function. . . . Upon them devolved the duty of giving progressive instructions in God's redeeming purposes." ‖ Such are the conclusions of the learned, in the absence of more authoritative information. They are substantially agreed in giving to the *teacher* of the primitive Church a place in its

* Paul himself, for example, 1 Cor. i, 1; xiv, 18; 1 Tim. ii, 7, etc.

† Compare Acts xxi, 9; 1 Tim. ii, 12. ‡ Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

§ Dr. H. Cremer's Biblical and Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek; also Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of New Testament Greek. ‖ Cremer.

organization, but with a function special and distinctive from that of the *prophet*.

On this hypothesis the teacher represented the authority and wisdom of man, but the prophet represented the authority and wisdom of God. Woman was thence necessarily ineligible to the position of public "teacher," because its function would not only conflict with, but actually reverse, the order of pre-eminence and subordination existing between man and woman since the fall—the ground on which Paul places the prohibitive law in the passage under consideration.* For, in contra-distinction, the *prophetess*, προφῆτις, stood specially near to God, acted under God's influence, spoke on God's authority, communicated God's message, and assumed God's place by his own express and exclusive appointment. Hence woman as prophetess did not, and could not, "usurp authority over the man" in the same sense in which it was exercised by the teacher; and in the prophetic office man could not claim an exclusive monopoly based on nature, grace, or sin, but held it conjointly with woman, by divine appointment, and not of human authority. However, whether we accept or not this hypothesis, four things are clearly ascertained as matters of fact: (1) That in the New Testament sense prophet and teacher represented different and distinct duties, as their appellations and the apostolic discriminations designate; (2) of the two, the prophet was an officer of higher order than the teacher; (3) woman was debarred from the position of teacher because inconsistent with her present relation of subordination under the judicial sentence of sin; and (4) her ineligibility to the office of teacher was no bar to her service in public life as prophetess, whatever that may import. Her silence is thence imposed as becoming, because as teacher it were abnormal, unseemly, and an utter sacrifice of her *gratia modestiæ* to be found before the public wrangling or wrestling with men on grave questions of law or duty, criticising, fault-finding, questioning, disputing, and dictating with a masculine assumption of authority such as would evidently tend to disturb the solemnities of churchly assemblies, extending even to unnatural disagree-

* "A woman's public teaching was an approach to ruling over the man. . . . The silence was enjoined for the subjection, and not subjection for the silence."—Dr. De Loss Love, p. 30.

ments and disorder at home. None of these disagreeable peculiarities were present in the duties and service of the prophet.

It may be helpful to our better understanding of this whole question to ascertain the exact historical condition of woman among the nations where the Gospel was first preached, before entering into a more critical investigation of her true attitude, as fixed in the New Testament, on the point of silence and subordination in the services of the Church.

Her social *status* was simply deplorable. It has been so through all the historic ages, if we except a possible period in ancient Egypt.* The birth of a son is the occasion of great joy in the family; but that of a daughter is regarded as a great calamity—so afflictive, indeed, that the father refuses to look upon his own child, or to speak to its mother, while friends hasten to sympathize with the father as being greatly injured, and upbraid the innocent sufferer as having perpetrated upon him some great wrong!† In India, under such humiliation, the unwelcome little one is often buried alive.‡ The lady of rank and the hard-worked peasant daughter are alike ignorant and degraded; and to teach them to read is accounted a folly and a sin.§ Some believe that women have no souls, and are not fit for society.‖ As a wife, woman is wedded from childhood, not, however, by her own choice or consent, but under the control of others;¶ nor is she treated with the affection of a companion, but is doomed to be a slave,** whose duty it is to drudge for her husband's comfort and pleasure, literally bearing all burdens,†† and performing all menial offices.‡‡ To maintain parents is made compulsory with daughters.§§ An ancient custom is held in honor, in which an absent husband declines inquiring about the health of his wife at home.

* Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," vol. i, p. 4; Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," etc., vol. ii, p. 46.

† Dr. Thomson's "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 177; Miss Rogers' "Domestic Life in Palestine," p. 392.

‡ Rev. J. D. Brown, deceased, returned missionary from India.

§ "Scripture Manners and Customs," p. 271; "Domestic Life in Palestine," p. 123.

‖ Miss Rogers, p. 123. ¶ Rev. P. M. Buck, India Conf., M. E. Church.

** "Scripture Manners and Customs," p. 270.

†† Lane's "Modern Egyptians," vol. i, p. 252; Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," vol. ii, pp. 46, 47.

‡‡ Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," vol. ii, pp. 223, 224.

§§ Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," vol. ii, p. 47.

he knowing her to be sick, although he carefully inquires about every body else. He never writes to her, but to a son, if they have one, and to a fictitious one if they have not. The Arabs even scandalize their own wives by speaking of them to others in a manner as infamous as it is suggestive of indelicacy and uncleanness.* The Chakams affect a holy horror at being touched by any part of a woman's dress.† "They pronounce women to be weak and inferior in most absolute terms, and in accordance with this idea is their deportment toward them. . . . It is very common to see small boys lord it over both mother and sisters in a most insolent manner: and they are encouraged to do so by the father. The evils resulting from this are incalculable. . . . Cases are rare where the husband has not, at some time or other, resorted to the lash to enforce obedience in his rebellious household. . . . Instances are not rare in which the husband kills the wife outright, . . . and no legal notice is taken of the murder."‡

To speak to a woman in public, even to his own wife, was one of those six things which a rabbi was not allowed to do.§ "In the Vinaya, a Bhikshu is not only forbidden to speak to or look at a woman, but he may not hold out his hand to his own mother even if she were drowning."‖ Thus the Brahmin in India, the Celestial of China, the Turk of Constantinople, the Jew of old Palestine, the Copt of ancient Egypt, the poet of cultured Greece, the senator of powerful Rome, have alike treated woman with undisguised contempt, and held it as a cardinal virtue to assign her to a mean and abject silence. Said Sophocles: "Order saves those who obey command; by those who rule this with firm hand it should always be sustained, and never for a woman be overturned." Said Euripides, the Athenian poet: "For a woman silence, sobriety, and in-doors are an adornment."¶ Said Callistratus, the model of Demosthenes, and great patron of eloquence: "The ornament of trees is foliage; of sheep, wool; of horses, the mane; of men, the beard; of women, silence."** So in tragedy

* "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 176. † Frankl's "Jews in the East," vol. ii, p. 81.

‡ "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 187.

§ Berachoth, fol. 43, b; Schwab, p. 404; see also Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. i, p. 214, note.

‖ Wilson's "Religion of the Hindus," vol. i, p. 360.

¶ Eurip., Heracl., 476. ** Whedon's quotation, N. T. Com., vol. iv, p. 111.

Medea expresses the bitterest irony respecting public opinion of her sex, and receives sympathy from the chorus:—

ΜΗΔ.—Ἐπίστασαι δὲ· πρὸς δὲ καὶ πεφύκαμεν
γυναῖκες, εἰς μὲν ἐσθλ' ἀμηχανώταται,
κακῶν δὲ πάντων τέκτονες σοφώταται.

ΧΟ.—Δίκα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται. . . .
Στρέφουσι φᾶμαι.
Ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει·
οὐκέτι δυσκέλαδος
φάμα γυναῖκας ἕξει.*

MED.—But thou art capable: and also, besides, by nature
We women indeed are least competent in things noble,
While shrewdest plotters of all kinds of mischief.

CHO.—The rules of justice and every thing are again reversed;
Traditions change—
Character is coming to the female race:
No longer shall an ignoble
Reputation attach to women.

Said a Roman: "What has a woman to do with public haranguing?" And the answer was given: "Nothing, if our ancient customs prevail."† Said wise men: "Women should not read in the law for the sake of the honor of the synagogue!" Said Schoettgen: "Women were allowed in rabbinical schools, but only to hear, and never to speak or to ask a question." An outer court of the ancient temple was appropriated to women, but in a synagogue they were not permitted to *read*, though this was never denied to a child or a servant. "A certain matron asked Rabbi Eleazar: 'Wherefore were the Israelites who committed but one crime about the golden calf punished with a threefold penalty?' Eleazar replied: 'Women ought to know nothing but the distaff!'" "May the words of the law be burned rather than placed in the hands of women."‡ Rabbies did not hesitate on most trivial pretenses to vindicate their supposed right to degrade women by enforced ignorance, and then to despise the womanhood they had degraded by consigning it to shame and silence. Because in the law (Deut. v, 1; xi, 19) where the duty of instruction is imposed, the Hebrew *verbs* appear in the *masca-*

* Eurip., Med., ls. 408–411, 417–420.

† Valer. Max., iii, 8.

‡ "Bammidbar Rabba," fol. 204, 4, 9, quoted by Bloomfield.

*line* gender, it was insisted, on that ground, that a *mother* was debarred from teaching her own son; also from teaching herself, because it was required to teach the "*children;*" and so none was authorized to teach a *woman*, because it was said, "Ye shall teach them to your *sons*," and it was not said also, "to your *daughters!*"* "Rabbis predicate four peculiarities of women: That they are wanton, (*luxuriosæ.*) that they are listeners, (*auscultatrices,*) lazy, (*pigræ,*) envious, (*zelosæ.*) Our rabbis judge that women are not lawful witnesses, (*illegitimas.*)"†

Out of this degraded female commonalty, naturally enough, there sprang manners characteristic of the sex when thus conditioned: manners of excitability, of disorder, and confusion extremely offensive to the cultured, and out of all propriety in the Christian assemblies. This was a subject of complaint in the fourth Christian century. Chrysostom describes the annoyance experienced under his own preaching thus: "Then, indeed, the women, from such teaching, *kept silence;* but now there is apt to be great noise among them, much clamor and talking, and nowhere so much as in this place. They may all be seen here talking more than in the market or at the bath. For, as if they came hither for recreation, they are all engaged in conversing upon unprofitable subjects. Thus *all is confusion*, and they seem not to understand that unless they are quiet they cannot learn any thing that is useful. For when our discourse strains against the talking, and no one minds what is said, what good can it do them?"‡

Finally, Dr. Anderson, describing the excitability and garrulity instinctive with women in the East, as illustrated in a church service under the supervision of a missionary lady, states: "The chapel was early full of women, all sitting on the floor, and each one crowding to get as near her as possible. They were very much like a hive of bees. The slightest thing would set them all in commotion, and they resembled a town-meeting more than a religious gathering. When a child cried, it would enlist the energies of half a dozen women with voice and gesture to quiet it. When some striking thought of some speaker flashed upon the mind of some woman, she would be-

* See Wetstein's quotation in full of "Kidduschim," fol. 29. 2.

† Buxtorf's Rabbinical Lexicon, col. 1.401, 1.402.

‡ Chrysostom, quoted by Dr. Whedon, New Testament Commentary, vol. iv, p. 111.

gin to explain it in no moderate tones to those about her, and this would set the whole off into a bedlam of talk which it would require two or three minutes to quell." *

With this unchanged and unchanging light upon both the picture and the page, we may begin to apprehend something of the difficulty and offense as they existed before Paul's mind. Corinthian women, from the instincts of their language and sex, were excitable and given to talkativeness. Of these, the great uncultured commonalty were offensively garrulous in the house of God, and violated the proprieties of the place. The public services were disturbed and disorderly. Probably masses of curious and unchristianized women were present in the congregations and contributed to this result. From Paul's frequent recurrence in this chapter to "the gift of tongues," it would seem that a good deal of noisy utterance and irregularity proceeded thence, suggestive of "madness" and "confusion." † Prophets and other officers of instruction were taken under apostolic direction. It was not the use, but the abuse, of these services that fell under censure. Against all this disorderly conduct, Paul's protest comes with all the purpose and directness of his own great character. With unusual emphasis and earnestness, he exclaims with a reason: "For God is not the author of confusion, ‡ but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." Then, rising to the dignity of his position, Paul commands the occasion, suppresses all commotion, and with his characteristic point and purpose, specifies: "Let your women *keep silence*," etc. All this is in perfect harmony with all the circumstances indicated, and meets every demand of the occasion without doing violence to the service or its cause. The picture is more than merely natural—it addresses itself to our intuitions as true.

Aside from the context, however, it is sufficiently apparent that there was, and must have been, some special *occasion* for the "shame" and "silence" so repeatedly invoked upon the character and conduct of these women in the church. To the thoughtful mind the logical inference is unavoidable that there

* "Oriental Churches," ii. 277. † Compare 1 Cor. xiv. 9–12, 16–19, 23–26, 33.

‡ This "*confusion*" (ἀκαταστασία, *disorder, commotion, tumult*) stands opposed in the antithesis to "*peace*." (εἰρήνη, *quiet, tranquility,*) and explains the character of the command which follows immediately: "Let your women *keep silence*," etc.

existed some custom, or fact, or some custom in fact, and out of the usual character, which was regarded as an abuse of privilege, and stood related to this ruling, whereupon Paul proceeds to lay down this prohibitive law; since so severe an interdiction fulminated upon any one class of believers, not applicable to all elsewhere, were unintelligible and inappreciable and impossible if it were wholly imaginary, baseless, and uncalled for. It is the need that necessitates the law. What that need was is already quite apparent. Further than this, it may be safely and fearlessly affirmed that neither in the texts themselves yet to be investigated, nor in their respective contexts, nor elsewhere in the Christian Scriptures, is there a shadow of warrant authorizing the opinion that the seal of silence was divinely placed on the lips of Christian women, when properly engaged in the public services of the sanctuary. For it must be borne in mind that the question, disembarrassed and simplified, is not now whether women are *entitled to preach the Gospel*, but whether they are remanded to *an absolute and perpetual silence* when related to the services in the Church of Jesus.

In pressing this inquiry, we may waive any instinctive desire common to the Teutonic races, and suppress any argument looking to the ennobling of woman's character, to the appreciation of her worth, to the honor of her love, to her assignment to an equality with man in accordance with the position, development, culture, and wealth of her womanhood. These are conditions which address themselves to our intelligence and appreciation; but the specific inquiry proposed leads to a critical examination of the words employed by Paul to the Corinthians, with special reference to the laws of etymology and emphasis involved: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their [*ἰδίους, own*] husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." 1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35.

The command thus strikes thrice and transversely across the position of the Christian woman when she enters the place and assumes the attitude of divine worship. *Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται αὐταῖς*

λαλεῖν . . . αἰσχρὸν . . . γυναιξὶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λαλεῖν. *Let your women in the churches keep silence: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; . . . a shame . . . for women to speak in* [the] *church.* These parts of the paragraph involve the points to be specially considered. We quote the common text, though a critical text will not affect our argument. The sentences are certainly significant. Many regard them as mandatory in purpose and unquestionable in character, teaching that for women in church silence is enjoined, and to speak is a shame. The examination of two or three words, whose emphasis and etymology are involved, will discover whether or not the interdiction of speech is absolutely imposed upon the Christian women of our worshiping assemblies. The verb σιγάτωσαν (*let them keep silence*) is sufficiently expressive; but the subjects of that command are the women of the Corinthian Church, to which the epistle was sent.*

The verb λαλέω is twice employed here to designate the character of the speaking or utterance which was regarded as disorderly, and so was forbidden: "Not permitted unto them *to speak* . . . a shame *to speak* in the church." This word, λαλέω, is one of the onomatopoetic class whose sound is suggestive of the sense, as is illustrated by such words as *thunder*, *rumbling*, *splash*, *babble*, *chatter*, and the like. The stem λαλ, *lal*, like *bar*, in barbarous, is considered to be based on its peculiar sound,† and so inherently conveys a signification of the same character. Thus, in comparative philology, it stands related to Latin *lallare*, to sing; German *lallen;* English *lull*, *lullaby*, etc. The word-radical, in itself, strictly expresses inarticulate sounds, but not intelligible speech; and so it is frequently applied in classic usage to inanimate objects, designating the murmuring of the trees, or instrumental music, as ἐν αὐλῷ λαλεῖν,‡ *to play on a flute*, or, μάγαδιν λαλεῖν,§ *to sound the harp.* So λαλέω is employed to indicate the utterances of the lower

* Dr. Duryea, making a defensive statement of the action of the Brooklyn Presbytery excluding women from participating, except silently, in public religious services, says: "Perceiving this fact, some have expressed the wish that Paul had added to his injunction—'*in Corinth.*' But he did not add it!" Nor was it needed. At the very beginning of this epistle he formally dedicated it to "*the Church which is at Corinth.*" Repetition was uncalled for.

† Valpy on Greek Language, p. 159.

‡ Theocrit., xx, 29. § Anax., Hoplom., 1.

animals, the twitter of birds, the chirping of locusts, the chattering of monkeys, and the barking of dogs, as in λαλοῦσι μὲν οὗτοι φράζουσι δὲ οὔ*—*these, indeed, utter sounds, but they speak not.* Thence, by easy transition—by one remove from empty vocabilities—the word comes to be appropriated to beings of intelligence, and, in reference to little children, conveys the sense of *clack*, or *prattle*,† as in παιδάριον ὢν δεινότατος λαλεῖν ἐδόκουν εἶναι,‡ *I, being a little child, was thought to be a most astonishing one to prattle;* and ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν,§ *I was accustomed to prattle as a little child.* Hence, Dr. Robinson defines the proper meaning of λαλέω to be, "*to use the voice without any necessary reference to words spoken, and thus differing from* εἰπεῖν, *to speak*, and λέγειν, *to say.*" ‖ So in later Greek this word, still holding tenaciously to its stem-sense, becomes applied to utterances of a strange or foolish character. ¶

A careful analysis of the uses of λαλέω in the New Testament develops several particulars worthy of note in this connection. It occurs therein, in all, two hundred and ninety-four times, of which in two hundred and eighty-six instances the word stands related to persons, thrice it is applied to thunders, thrice to blasphemies of the beast, once to the utterances of the law, and yet once to the blood of Jesus "that speaketh better things than that of Abel." However, the character of the utterances themselves, rather than the number of persons indicated, is the thing that is conclusive of the

* Plutarch, ii, 909, A.

† So Yonge and Robinson.

‡ Xenophon, Cyropædia, i, 4, 12.

§ Paul, 1 Cor. xiii, 11.

‖ The philologist will be pleased to trace this radical sense throughout this word-family. The several members may be grouped thus:—

α. *The agent:* λάλαξ, λαλητής, λαλαγήτης, and ἡ λαλητρίς, *prattler, prater, babbler, croaker.*

β. *The action:* λαλεω, λαλαγέω, παραλαλέω, καταλαλέω, *to prattle, babble, chirrup, chirp, prate at random, chatter;* ἀλαλάζω, *to shout.*

γ. *The effect:* λαλιά, λάλη, λαλαγή, λάλημα, λάλαγμα, *a babbling, prattle, gossip, chattering talk;* also, ἀλαλη, ἀλαλά, ἀλαλαγή, *a loud cry or shout;* ἀλαλητός, *a war-cry.*

δ. *The quality:* λαλητικός, λάλος, *given to babbling;* ἀλάλητος, *unutterable.*

¶ "Compare in English 'to talk nonsense,' that is, foolishly." Robinson's Lexicon, p. 422. Illustrative examples may be found in 1 Tim. v, 13: "Tattlers also, and busy-bodies, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα, speaking things which they ought not;" Jude 16: "Their mouth λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, speaketh great swelling words," (that is, *boastful;*) 2 Cor. xi, 23: "παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, *I speak as a fool.*" 1 Cor. xiv, 9; 2 Cor. xii, 4; Matt. xii, 34, etc.

*usus* of the word.* Of the total two hundred and ninety-four instances occurring in the New Testament, about one hundred and sixty-six are referable to some external circumstance or textual adjunct denotive of stress or excitement, and one hundred and four additional represent some kind of supernatural communication; and, exclusive of the two instances now under consideration, there remain only twenty-two places wherein the word has an application to speech of ordinary character. Then of the two hundred and eighty-six examples involving *persons*, only sixteen show a usage of the word in a condition of things suggestive of application to a tranquil mind. In this very chapter λαλέω is applied to revelation once, to mystery once, to intelligent speech once, to prophesying twice, and to unknown tongues seventeen times, and twice it is applied to women, making twenty-four occurrences in all. As showing the great preponderance of probabilities touching the meaning of the word as applied in the New Testament in the direction of excited communication, these facts have a value which should not be overlooked in this expository argument; and the usage of the word in the chapter shows this infrequency of its application by Paul to ordinary speaking—once in twenty-four times.

Classic *usus*, then, exhibits the word itself, with all its word-family in strange unanimity, as conveying the fundamental sense of *chattering* or *babbling:* a view designated by Dr. Robinson as "using the voice without any necessary reference to words spoken, and so differing from εἰπεῖν and λέγειν." Then the New Testament, carrying forward this sense, modifies and applies it to things strange and foolish, perhaps also to the "gift of tongues;" and thence it passes to intelligent speech, but in a character of excited communication for the most part, which, in effect, where many persons are engaged in animated conversation, would inevitably lead to chattering or babbling, with the attendant idea of commotion, in public assemblies. And, in exact correspondence with these indications, we have the fact of the instinctive dispositions and characteristics of

* Rev. Mr. Ross says, (Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xxvi, p. 342:) "The usage of the word in the New Testament is conclusive on this point," and then proceeds in proof to enumerate the instances and usage of the *translators of our English version.* Surely the critical and scholarly will hardly accept the English translation, itself undergoing revision, as "*conclusive*" of the etymology of the Greek Testament.

the commonalty of women in Bible countries, with all the accompanying confusion and babel, as exampled in the historical illustration cited in the mission scene, and the description given by Chrysostom in the fourth Christian century. If, now, the context of this passage be found to sustain this view, the conviction will become almost resistless that the kind of speaking referred to, and denounced by Paul as a "shame" to women in Churches, was nothing other than a bedlam of chattering, unbecoming the house of God, and utterly demoralizing to the services of the sanctuary. Indeed, this whole chapter is an energetic effort on Paul's part to reform the Church of abuses noisy and babbling in character:—

Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking (λαλέω) with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak (λαλέω) to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine? and even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? . . . So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken (λαλέω)? for ye shall speak (λαλέω) into the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification; therefore, if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh (λαλέω) a barbarian, and he that speaketh (λαλέω) shall be a barbarian unto me. Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church. . . . Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? . . . If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak (λαλέω) with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? . . . How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any man speak (λαλέω) in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course. . . . If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace; for ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn. . . . For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the saints. Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, (λαλέω;) but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak (λαλέω) in the church. . . . Let all things be done decently and in order.

These strictures of the apostle in reference to parties gathered in Church, represented as a collection of persons piping and harping without giving forth distinct sounds; this declaration that unless they speak words easy to be understood they speak into the air; this comparison of the scene of unknown tongues to barbarians and madness; this medley described in their coming together, produced by their psalms, doctrines, tongues, revelations, and interpretations; this direction that speakers shall proceed "only by two, or at the most by three, and that by course;" this requirement that when something is revealed to one sitting by, "the first shall hold his peace;" this direct protest that God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all the Churches of the saints; this closing sentence: "Let every thing *be done decently and in order*"—*this state of facts* reveals sources of disorder and occasions of annoyance which loudly called for reproof and suppression, and with reference to which the women were ordered back into silence, because forward in meaningless utterances and medley demonstrations in the Christian Churches.

Now, in all this there is nothing as yet that appears in the text or context which is conclusive of Paul's intention to discriminate against women of real culture and Christian propriety in common with the garrulous crowd, or against Christian women of any other age or any other country than that where this reform of abuse was in demand, or that women were remanded to silence in the Churches for any other offense than that already described and illustrated. *Petitio principii* is not proof: assumption is not even probability. At this point direct issue is made with the advocates of the opposite view. The *onus probandi* rests with the affirmant, to show that the law enforcing silence was in intent absolute and universal, as is claimed, and so was intended to apply to all women in all countries in all time; that the word λαλέω, a key-word to the interpretation, does not mean what its radical sense shows, to *chatter, clamor*, or *talk*, but does mean, in distinction, all manner of public address appertaining to Church services; in short, that the rule enforcing silence upon women was not related to any class of persons, as at Corinth, or to any particular offense among them, but referred to public speaking generally, and so in its measure and purpose was *absolute*, and therefore un-

qualifiedly absolute—so that now women of high endowments, of beautiful character and culture, and delicate persuasions to all that is good, are forever remanded to a suppression of speech, to an absolute silence in the service of song; that the interdiction of utterance falls with full effect upon all such as would render churchly response in the liturgy; that women in all Christendom are to-day acting in weekly and open violation of this divine command whenever, in our churches, they open their lips to repeat the Lord's prayer, or whenever they proceed to teach others in the Sunday-school, or whenever they break the silence within church walls by Christian salutations, or whenever they express their yearnings of soul in social services in behalf of themselves or their children or friends, or whenever they would individually be instructed by their ministers in the church, since the same iron law rules *absolutely*, "If they will learn, let them ask their husbands at home;" and if they have no husbands, or if their husbands are as ignorant and degraded as themselves, let them go untaught in the Lord by express provision, utterly interdicting the Lord's own commission: "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the Gospel to every creature;*" much less shall any woman be found praying or speaking in public, though both had their place in the apostolic Church, as appears in this very epistle, and within four chapters of this very place, where Paul does not suppress *the thing*, but only governs the *manner* of its performance, when he says: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head." 1 Cor. xi, 5.

To such extremes must the adherents of the opposition go, in order to be thoroughly consistent. Extreme as these conclusions are, they are legitimate to the premises assumed by the advocates of woman's *absolute* silence, as imposed to be perpetuated in the Christian Church. For they who champion that cause are painfully embarrassed with the inconsistency of their position. Prominent among these is the Rev. Mr. Ross, whose articles on this subject appeared in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," as named at the head of this paper. He says:—

> This *reason*, to which Paul refers, is *as* [illegible] *ancient and extensive as the race itself.* . . . So long as man is made male and female, the reason of *the prohibition exists*

Let it be understood that these commands are *general rules* (!) for fully-constituted Churches. They *admit of exceptions* in case of *weak Churches* composed

*unimpaired.* and, of course, the prohibition itself *abides in full force.*

The reasons given [for silence imposed] are *as extensive as . . . the human family,* and *as permanent as the law of the sexes.* . . . Paul secures order . . . by prohibiting positively, expressly, repeatedly, and *unqualifiedly,* the women *from speaking at all.*—P. 340.

almost entirely of women, and female teachers of the ignorant negro and heathen. It is *not only permitted* to women, but *it becomes their duty to do,* in such case, what it would be improper for them to do *in well-constituted Churches.* —P. 756.

It is interesting, at least, to understand how a prohibition pronounced as absolutely "permanent as the law of the sexes," "prohibiting positively, expressly, repeatedly, and unqualifiedly, the women from speaking at all," should yet be made mere "general rules" which "admit of exceptions" *ad libitum;* and how, "so long as man is made male and female the reason of the prohibition exists unimpaired," and "the prohibition abides in full force," yet the inflexible law and its reason are so accommodating as to get completely reversed in case of "weak" Churches, or those not "fully constituted," so that what would be improper (?) in well-constituted Churches actually becomes a high Christian "duty" in others!* So the great iron rule of the apostle crumbles away in the presence of the first case of expediency, and the "unqualified" injunction is dissolved wherever "the ignorant negro and heathen" are involved! This doctrine of shifting and shiftless *expediency* is as dangerous as it is injudicious when falling into the hands of an expositor who teaches it to be not a sin, but only "improper," and not only allowable, but actually a Christian "duty," for good and gifted women to violate at times so plain a law of divine prohibition! This is not only a complete departure from Paul's "unqualified" precept, as it is assumed to be, but it literally relegates the whole subject at last to human judgment for decision. For, if exceptions are allowable at all, the rule has ceased beyond recall to be of universal application, and the "prohibition," which was supposed to be "as permanent as the race itself," breaks down completely, only leaving it to human judgment to determine when women may speak and when they shall be suppressed in the godly exercise of their Christian gifts in the churches. If, then, Mr.

* "It is not denied that women properly qualified may teach and exhort familiarly in the household, and in the social circle and Bible class." But "shall a woman in a *formally constituted assembly of the Church* assume the place and perform the office of minister?"—DR. DURYEA.

Ross should proceed with self-constituted autocratic authority to decide so debatable a question in a given case, what would he have to say when others, and women, his equals in judgment, we will suppose, should choose to differ with all deference from his conclusion?

Moreover, this "prohibition" is as absolutely "permanent and extensive as the race itself," or it is *not*. If it is, no human power under any pretext can suspend or vacate its application in any case whatever, for its violation were simply sinful, and the plea of expediency or necessity cannot be allowed. Nowhere is Paul himself found referring to admitted "exceptions in case of weak Churches," or places without "a formally constituted assembly." He furnishes no subterfuge for evasion or escape. His language is simple and unqualified: "Let your women keep silence in the churches." Let those who interpret this command as dooming women of noble gifts and high culture and Christian grace to an absolute and perpetual silence in the Christian Church whenever they worship God, stand by the impossible and absurd conclusions to which they are forced by the principle of consistency, or surrender a theory which they cannot prove in the light of historic facts, and so accept an interpretation which shows that the apostle's mind was directed against an *abuse*,* and not a use, of privilege; against disorderly chatterings of women in the church, and not against the Christian women themselves offering services with all propriety—as when the court-crier commands "silence in court," it is understood that disorder must cease, that business may proceed undisturbed. Now, if Paul really meant, as is assumed, that his prohibition should be *not* universal, but be inoperative in a large class of exceptional instances, why did he not tell us so himself explicitly? And if he did make its application universal, why are the advocates of women's silence found insisting on exceptions to his ruling? And if he did *not* legislate a prohibition that was permanent for all time, and as universal as the race, why do they argue that he did? And if he has left the application of the law an open question, to be sometimes valid and sometimes vacated, who is to decide in the absence of divine authority? But what is the mean-

* "This whole fourteenth chapter is devoted to directions, . . . in order to correct *certain abuses in their public worship*."—Mr. Ross, p. 350.

ing of this attempt to hold on to "both horns of the dilemma" at the same time; this endeavor to inconsistently interpret a given precept as unqualifiedly absolute, and yet as unqualifiedly conditional—as necessarily applicable to the women of all Christendom during all time, but with as many exceptions in reserve unknown to the Scriptures as the interpreter may choose to elect; to muzzle the mouths of all Christian, cultured women in the direction of good when within Church walls, by the forced interpretation of a rule they cannot maintain — unless it be to show by these very embarrassments, which complicate the position, that the arguments adduced are utterly illogical, and the interpretations made are at war with Gospel truth?

We conclude, therefore, that the kind of meeting in which women are commanded to keep silence is *every sort of religious meeting* where both sexes are present.—Mr. Ross, p. 352.

*Sabbath-schools* are not *the kind* of meetings described or referred to. . . . The word "*silence*" *does not cover singing*, for it was used with express reference to speaking. If we appeal to logic, let us be governed by it.—P. 756.

Well, well! Now give us a new dictionary, that we may be instructed how singing is simply another way to "*keep silence!*" And does it not seem a little peculiar that the rule that applies *universally* to Church assemblies does not work in certain "*kinds*" of meetings; and that Sabbath-schools have to be set aside as impliedly so irreligious in character as to be excluded from "every sort of religious meeting?" This will strike the Christian intelligence of the community as a marvelous discovery—the more since Paul himself, so far from having "*described or referred to*" any "*kind*" of religious meetings whatever, did not himself even hint that such a discrimination was possible! What he did say was: "Let your women keep silence in the churches." There is neither classification nor limitation beyond that. "*Kind* of religious meeting" is an after thought with expositors, but without warrant from Paul. To maintain, then, that the rule which prohibits speech is at once "permanent and extensive as the race itself," but altogether dependent on the kind of religious meetings in each instance where it is to apply, is as illogical in reasoning as it is absurd in fact. "If we appeal to logic, let us be governed by it," truly! Even Dr. Duryea adopts this indefensible mode of statement. He says: "The phrase 'keep silence' stands for a

word that excludes *all forms of speech.* But it is objected: 'This leads to absurdity.' A woman cannot respond in the services, or sing in the act of praise! To this is sufficient the answer: Teaching involves authority, and so superiority. Devotional utterance assumes nothing of the sort."

Now, it may be a "sufficient answer" for the purpose had in view by Dr. Duryea, but it is, nevertheless, not a sufficient answer, unless it be implied that "*devotional utterance*" and "*singing*" mean to "*keep silence!*" The objection is not vacated by the answer. The fallacy of his argument discovers itself in holding to a theory which assumes that the law to be universally observed must be universally binding, while yet he himself undertakes to discharge that obligation on his own responsibility whenever in his judgment its application would eventuate in absurdity! To maintain the absoluteness of the law is to surrender the right to discriminate in its applications to different kinds of religious meetings. Both cannot be true. One other hypothesis frees the situation from all the absurdities that unavoidably attach to this: namely, that the apostle's rule designs to suppress the noisy interruptions and chatterings incident to Churchly assemblies; aims to suppress *the abuses*, but not to suppress a majority of members in Christ's Church—a view which may be extended to include the improper use of the gifts of prophecy and tongues suppressed by Paul when he protests that "*God* is not the author of *confusion*, but of quiet in all the Churches of the saints."

Another difficulty confronts those who oppose this right of speech within the Christian Church. The advocates of this doctrine are manifestly embarrassed at finding themselves at cross-purposes with Paul where he merely offers a regulation to govern the manner of public address, instead of silencing outright all manner of speech by an express injunction. In this same epistle, within four chapters of this same place, and in respect to some of these same women, Paul said: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head." As to the fact of praying and prophesying in the church no remark whatever is made by Paul. In the legislative sense there is neither express permission nor prohibition. Rather, both services are assumed to be entirely right, as a matter of course. Yet he prescribes *how* these shall

be conducted before Christian assemblies. Now, this was the moment of all others to extinguish forever all female prophecy and prayer if he would. It could not have failed in the understanding of all Christendom beyond recall had he chosen to say just then that the services of womanly prayer and prophesying should be henceforth discontinued. But did he do it? Nothing of the kind. Instead of remanding to silence the gifted women thus engaged, he points out simply an impropriety of their manner, giving a reason, and then directing how these services shall be conducted thereafter. To govern the method implies the continuance of the service. To say that Paul undertook in the first instance to regulate the *way* in which public prayer and prophecy were to proceed, and then, chapters afterward, returned to the subject and interdicted the prophecy and prayer themselves, is simply incredible in the absence of a necessitating theory. Nor is it Pauline thus to take offensive troubles by sections. His directness of character always goes to the core at once. To suppose that he peremptorily *un*did at last, as wrong, what he took in hand, allowed by silence, and regulated by a special legislation, at the first, as right, is to deprive the whole procedure of that noble judgment and directness which so distinguished the mind of this famous apostle.

"Paul for the time seems to allow the practice, while he condemns the manner of its performance. . . . He may have allowed an existing custom to pass unrebuked while he called attention to the indecency of its performance; and, having rebuked the indecency, he may in another part of the same letter have forbidden the custom itself."—Mr. Ross, p. 353. "A precept of an apostle may discontinue a previous custom."—Dr. Duryea.

In point of fact, Paul does not "*seem*" to allow the practice, *but he allows it!* Besides, to "discontinue a *custom*" is one thing, and to discontinue a *prophet* is quite another. "A precept of an apostle *may* discontinue a previous *custom*," but we do not know that any apostle ever suppressed a Christian *prophetess*. Nor is it pertinent to suppose what Paul "*may*" or "*might*" have done; we are only interested in what he *did* do as a matter of fact. He might have commanded the sun to stand still, but he did not. So far from discontinuing the function of

the prophetess, prediction had foretold its place in the Christian system, and an apostle proclaimed it the divine will, and the Pentecost as the day when women were to be fully inaugurated to their prophetical work. We know, therefore, that women were appointed to this service, and were divinely endued and endowed for its sacred performance; and we have no authority for believing that their office was ever abolished, in distinction from that of the men, or, indeed, that it was ever abolished at all. What, then, was the precise attitude assigned to woman in the New Testament in respect to public speaking? what the divine appointment and purpose as to her rightful prerogative and function in the Church of Jesus?

Eight hundred years before the birth of Christ a Hebrew prophet arose who foretold the dispensation of the Spirit, who glorified the advantages of the Gospel, who predicted the function of prophecy to be bestowed on women as characteristic of the Church of Christianity. When, then, the day of Pentecost had come upon the apostles, Peter arose before the multitude, himself under the influence of the Spirit, and addressed his brethren, naming this prophet of the Hebrews, quoting the words of his prophecy, and proclaiming the occasion then present as the one of predicted power and fulfillment. He said: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy.'"*

Now it is worthy of note (1) that the Spirit's influence was bestowed upon men and women without distinction: "I will pour out of my Spirit *upon all flesh*;" (2) that the official function was conferred expressly upon men and women without distinction: "*Your sons and your daughters*;" and (3) the peculiar service imposed is rendered unusually emphatic in the sentence by position and repetition: "*Sons and daughters* . . . servants and *handmaidens* . . . *they shall prophesy*."† In the

* Acts ii, 16–18, quoting Joel ii, 28, 29.

† "Now God poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, so that men and women *did prophesy in the primitive Churches*."—Rev. Mr. Ross, p. 346.

course of sacred history the prophetical gift in the possession of woman was not a new thing. The odes of Deborah and Hannah were known to all the Hebrew ages after them, and the prophecies of Miriam and Huldah * belonged to the old dispensation; while in the apostolic period "there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phannel, of the tribe of Aser," (Luke ii, 36,) and also "four daughters" of Philip the evangelist, "virgins, which did prophesy."† Acts xxi, 8, 9. This special provision made in the Gospel scheme according to the ancient prediction, this express revival of the order on the day of Pentecost formally giving prominence to women, and the perpetuation of such service in the Christian Church, are facts of significance in the exposition of this subject.

Philologists and writers are silent as regards any distinction in the function of prophets in exercise by the two sexes. As the Scriptures are also silent, it may be safely assumed that none existed. Precisely what its sacred office designated, then, must be learned from the etymology of the terms employed to convey its character and purpose, from the coördinates prophet and prophetess, and the corresponding verbs, נבא and προφητεύω, which are equivalents in the Hebrew and Greek texts. *Prophet*, προφήτης, ὁ, (נָבִיא, *vates*,) is derived "from πρό, *before*, and φημί, *I speak*—not πρό, according to time, except in a secondary and derived sense, but as *to place* or *manner*." ‡ It designates a "person gifted for the exposition of divine truth;" § "a divine teacher," ‖ "one who speaks openly, . . . who proclaims a divine message," ¶ belonging to "a class of instructors or *preachers* next in rank to the apostles, and before the διδάσκαλοι;" ** "*an interpreter of scripture; a preacher.*" †† In respect to *prophetess*, προφῆτις, ἡ, (נְבִיאָה,) authorities indicate the difference by gender.

* Judges iv, 4: v; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Exod. xv, 20; 2 Kings xxii, 14.

† "We can find no instance in the Bible of a woman *speaking in public*."—Mr. Ross, p. 346. "Now God poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, so that men *and women* did prophesy in the Primitive Church."—P. 346.

"But he that prophesieth *speaketh unto men* to edification and exhortation and comfort. . . . But he that prophesieth *edifieth the church*."—Paul, 1 Cor. xiv, 3, 4.

"Our Lord commissioned no women among the apostles and evangelists."—Dr. Duryea. We must admire the ingenuity and prudence of this last and carefully-worded statement, as the omission of *prophets* and *prophetesses* is very significant.

‡ Dr. Cremer. § T. Sheldon Green's Lexicon of New Testament Greek.
‖ Greenfield. ¶ Cremer. ** Robinson. †† Liddell and Scott.

without a difference of service, designating her as "a gifted female teacher,"* "who has consecrated herself to God."† Besides the *predictive* sense represented in the Hebrew verb נבא, it means "to speak, to announce;"‡ "to teach the divine will;" "to instruct the people;"§ and its equivalent *προφητεύω* means "to set forth matter of divine teaching;"‖ "proclaiming God's will;"¶ "to exhort, reprove, threaten, under divine influence, as embassadors or interpreters of his will;"** "*to publicly expound, to preach.*"††

Three noteworthy facts are here settled philologically beyond questioning on the highest authorities known to criticism, namely, 1. That prophetess meant an interpreter of Scripture, an expounder, a preacher; 2. That her express vocation was to instruct the people, to exhort, to reprove, to preach, as the interpreter of Scripture; and, 3. That her proper place in the organization of the Christian Church was "next in rank to the apostles, and before the *διδάσκαλοι*." "The prophets of the New Testament were supernaturally illuminated *expounders* and *preachers*."‡‡ Yet Mr. Ross says: "*Prophecy* is never used in the New Testament for preaching."—P. 345. "In no passage in the New Testament can either the verb *προφητεύω*, or the noun *προφήτης* be proved to refer to, or include, ordinary *preaching*."—Pp. 345, 346. Dr. Van Dyke says: "We challenge the production of one, only one, clear instance of a woman being appointed or recognized of God as a *preacher*." Dr. Duryea says: "In the Apostolic Church it was *not* the custom for *women to preach*. . . . There is yet *no proof* that these inspired women exercised the gift *in public*, promiscuous, constituted assemblies of the Church." To all of which answer may be made: 1. That the etymology of the Greek and Hebrew prove that in the New Testament sense especially, *the prophet* was *a preacher*, and *prophesying* meant *preaching*. 2. That "preaching," as defined by Webster, means, "*To pronounce a public discourse*," and this idea, so ingrained in the word in the public understanding, puts the burden of proof upon those who

* Green. † Greenfield.
‡ Fuerst's Hebrew Lexicon.
§ B. Davidson's Analytical Hebrew Lexicon.
‖ Bagster's Analytical Lexicon of New Testament Greek.
¶ Cremer. ** Robinson. †† Liddell and Scott.
‡‡ Dr. Smith's Bible Dictionary, Hackett's edition, 1871.

claim that Christian prophetesses were accustomed to preach *in private*. Moreover, it must *be proved*, not assumed, that there was any distinction in the function or in the service as exercised by prophetic men and women, in the apostolic times. Paul distinctly affirms: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men (*ἀνθρώποις*) to edification and exhortation and comfort; . . . he that *prophesieth edifieth the Church*."

Dr. Duryea remarks: "If the Spirit chose in sovereignty to elect and inspire women with gifts of prophecy, and they could show the signs of a prophet, they were not forbidden to speak. Under the same conditions they would not be forbidden now." * Then women as prophets were not forbidden to speak in public at all in the primitive Church, since they certainly showed "the signs" when Anna and the "four daughters" of Philip were permitted the service by the Church, and "did prophesy." On the historical aspect of the question, at least, this is a surrender of the whole ground of controversy. What, then, was "not forbidden," and was comprehended in "the gift of prophecy?" Not only "*to preach*," as has been shown, for "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, . . . edifieth the Church." But now these women "were supernaturally illuminated expounders and preachers." So are all who are entitled to preach Jesus as "called of God," whether women or men. Whoever assumes to preach Christ without the divine or supernatural impression of its being his personal duty and responsibility, goes to the sacred work "*un*called and unauthorized," and renders it a perfunctory profession. An impression and influence from God upon the soul, whereby he realizes, "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel," are not natural, but supernatural. Supernatural illumination exhibits the seals of divine authority to preach as distinctly as the inspiration of God, if, indeed, they are not substantially one. The Christian preacher may not be inspired in the same measure and to the same purpose as apostles were when they wrote, or as prophets were when they predicted; but who knows that the impression and influence realized from God differ in any important aspect from what was experienced by prophets when they "preached, exhorted, edified, and comforted" the ancient Church? The faculty of

* Dr. Duryea.

prophecy, *per se*, covered both prediction and preaching; the supernatural illumination for preaching alone is none the less supernatural now that the element of prediction is omitted. And if it be claimed that women at present cannot show "the signs" of an ancient prophetess, and so should be excluded from participation in public services, what shall we say of *the men* also, who, as successors of the apostles, cannot claim to be inspired of God in the same sense? The test, if allowed in one case, must not be disallowed in the other. If women are now not inspired of God, neither are the men, and so both should be excluded from preaching in the Church of Christ. Our reasoning must be *argumentum ad judicium*, and not mere *argumentum baculinum*.

Dr. Van Dyke himself takes unwarrantable ground when he says: "The preaching of the Gospel by women is without warrant from Scripture;" and so they are unauthorized "to undertake the work which Christ and his apostles committed to *men*." He says nothing of the unauthorized abandonment of a service once distinctly and supernaturally committed to *women!* In support of his position he quotes Paul to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful *men* who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. ii, 2. Dr. Van Dyke is not critical. He has given us the English, which is ambiguous at least. Had he consulted the Greek text, he must have seen that the very point which he emphasizes as decisive for his view is in fact against him. The word is not ἀνήρ, *man*, in sharp contradistinction from woman, as he seems to assume, but ἄνθρωπος, which represents *both* men and women, and so is generally rendered "*an individual, a person, mankind.*" The passage then may read with strict propriety: "These things do thou commit *unto faithful persons*, who shall also be qualified to instruct others."

The following graceful paragraph will be appreciated, coming as it does from an eminent biblicist, known wherever the English language is spoken:—

"There is good reason why men should keep well in mind the peculiar benediction which rests on godly women, and their peculiar aptitude for efficient service under the Gospel. We ought to recognize their special capabilities; we ought to make the most of them, and devise methodical plans for that end by

the exercise of our best wisdom. No effort could be more in harmony with the will of Christ, and the practice of the apostles. Jesus Christ accepted the ministry of the Galilean women; and the apostle of Jesus Christ has messages of special earnestness and significance for 'women who labored with him in the Gospel.'" Phil. iv, 3.*

In view, then, of the historical degradation common to women among the ancient nations, as indicated in the maxims and usages of the sage and the orator, the legislator and the poet; in view of the manifest distinction of character and service existing between the offices of prophetess and teacher in the New Testament, to the first of which woman is eligible, while from the latter she was debarred on the ground of nature and grace; in view of the classical sense of λαλέω being *to chatter, to babble*, otherwise describing "inarticulate sounds, without any necessary reference to words spoken"—a sense shown to be common to all the branches of the Greek stem; in view of the large preponderance of probabilities indicating the prevailing usage of this word in the New Testament as having reference to some exciting cause or excitable occasion; in view of the natural impulse to chatter, and customs of noisy demonstrations characteristic of "the garrulous commonalty" of women in public assemblies in those countries, as illustrated in the missionary scene described, and a similar state of facts protested against by Chrysostom in the fourth century—scenes which were, indeed, "a shame" and a confusion in any Church of Christ; in view of the self-apparent fact that Paul's prohibition is directed against certain abuses which had sprung up in connection with the public services in the Church, as shown in this entire chapter, and especially in the verse which precedes the one under consideration, "For God is not the author of *confusion*, but of peace, (quietness,) in all Churches of the saints;" in view of the dedication of this epistle "*Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth*," whose abuses of privilege Paul is expressly correcting by the imposition of "silence" and "shame" for unchurchly behavior of women in their Christian assemblies; in view of the fact that the assumption that women universally are to be taken as the subject of σιγάτωσαν, "*let them keep silence*," consigns all, including the best gifted and cultured to an unquali-

* Dr. John S. Howson, Dean of Chester, England.

fied and perpetual silence within the Church of God, and suppresses all audible service by response, by prayer, by song, by speaking, by conversation, by teaching, in the Sabbath-school, in the Christian assembly, in the presence of the other sex, within the church walls; in view of the circumstances that womanly prophecy was so largely provided for in the Christian system, was so conspicuously proclaimed in ancient prediction, was so formally inaugurated in the Church of Christ on the day of Pentecost, was so unquestionably practiced in the times of the apostles; in view of the fact that the prophetical function was conferred upon men and women in common, without distinction or restriction, in the same sense, in the same measure, for the same purpose, and with the same warrant; in view of the consideration that praying and prophesying by women were a part of the public services in full exercise and recognition in the Christian assemblies of the Church when Paul's rules of silence were fulminated against the abuse and abusers of the Christian right of speech; in view of Paul having personally and previously corrected a mere matter of Christian impropriety pertaining to the manner of conducting this branch of the service, while prescribing its proper method of procedure for the future, without expressing one word of condemnation against the service itself as such, when he said, "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head;" in view of Paul's historical relation to this question, his subsequent return to the subject in order to abolish a service which had been ordained with so much circumstantiality at the beginning, and ordained by the same sanctions which ordained the apostolate itself, consigning in one sentence to an unqualified and perpetual silence and shame a whole order of prophetic women in distinction from prophetic men, without one word of explanation for the understanding of the ages to come—a procedure so violent to our intelligence as to seem utterly inconsistent, inconceivable, and impossible in the Pauline character; in view of there being no other scriptural ground whatever than these two passages now in controversy on which to base a conclusion that prophesying and praying in public, in the New Testament sense of these terms, were then withdrawn from women; in view of the fact, which is incontrovertible, that, whatever else prophesying and praying

in public meant, they did *not* mean to "*keep silence*," but did mean "to exhort, reprove, threaten, as embassadors or interpreters of God's word," and "to publicly expound, to preach," since "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort," and "he that prophesieth edifieth the Church;"—these considerations, taken unitedly, enforce the conclusion that Paul never contemplated for one moment issuing a decree of either specific condemnation upon the order of prophetic women in the Church, or of enforcing a law of universal silence upon the Christian women of all the ages, and that he never intended to suppress the ministry of a cultured spiritual womanly influence and service in the sanctuary where Christ is to be glorified; but that he did mean to put to "shame" and "silence" forever all public disorder and "confusion," as unbecoming as it is profaning to the solemnities and sanctity of the Church of Christ.

---

## Art. IV.—SOME PHASES OF THE CHINESE PROBLEM.

*The Chinese Problem.* By L. T. Townsend, D.D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1876.
*The Chinese in America.* By Rev. O. Gibson, A.M. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

The generation of men now passing away will long be remembered on account of their splendid successes in mastering the physical forces, and bringing them under intelligent control. The telegraph is their work, both as to its discovery and its application to the work of transmitting messages by land and sea. The steam-engine was in existence when they came on the stage, but it was very imperfect, and had all the uncertainty of a half-broken colt. It remained for them to train the colt to a trusty horse, and to so add strength to his muscles that he is equal to a race of a thousand miles across the plains and over the mountains, or to a show of marvelous strength and endurance in the factory or the press-room. Fulton's steamboat, which made such a sensation on the Hudson River seventy years ago, was the idea out of which, under their toil and genius, has grown the noble steamship now found on all waters. They did a noble work, and have in it an imperishable monument.

These victories over physical nature have paved the way to, and made inevitable, consequences of the greatest moment to our Christianity and civilization. They have practically annihilated distance, and so brought nations that we regarded as most remote to our very door. They have brought into the foreground questions that were before of the smallest possible importance. A quarter of a century ago the Chinese and Japanese were almost unknown to the American public. We thought of China and Japan as countries on the outskirts of civilization, in whose people we had little reason to interest ourselves. We ridiculed their customs and usages, so far as they were known to us, and made light of their forms of worship. But the rapid progress of steam navigation, with the laying of the ocean cables, and the consequent diffusion of knowledge and the means of easy and rapid transit across the ocean, has brought about a complete revolution. Not only do many English-speaking people visit or reside in what was once far-off Cathay, but the Chinese in numbers now confront us on our own shores. Men study the civilization and usages of the Chinese, not to gratify an idle curiosity, but because they are driven to it by the necessity which has brought them in contact with the Mongolian race. The religions of the Orient have acquired a new interest from the fact that their temples are set up and their followers abound in our own land. We are driven to investigation, because we must know what we would successfully oppose. The election of Dr. S. Wells Williams to the professorship of the Chinese language in Yale College, and the matriculation of scores of Chinese and Japanese youth in our various institutions of learning, are significant of occurring changes.* On the other hand, works are being written from the Chinese and Japanese stand-points against Christianity, and a learned disciple of Confucius daily expounds and defends the doctrines of his master in San Francisco.

This altered condition of affairs is not without its disturbing element on both sides of the Pacific. The Mongolian finds his old ways jostled by a new civilization which is creeping upon him, and gives vent to his indignation by an occasional out-

* The Chinese residents of San Francisco have petitioned the Board of Education of that city for a school for their children, to be conducted after the manner of other city schools.

break of violence among the masses, or in the steady opposition of the ruling classes. And on this side the presence of the Chinese has awakened a morbid fear, especially among the laboring classes of the Pacific coast, which finds vent in Anti-Chinese leagues, associations, and mobs; and, moreover, it has been deemed of sufficient importance to occupy a considerable part of a session of Congress.

The subject, though a new one, has called out quite a voluminous literature, including the two books which stand at the head of this article, each of which deals with a particular phase of this many-sided subject.

Dr. Townsend's work is an unpretentious little volume of eighty-six pages, which, in five successive chapters, treats of Chinese Immigration, as related to International Politics, Political Economy, Education, Morals, and Religion. The immediate cause of the appearance of the book, as appears from the author's preface, was "the recent hostile demonstrations against the Chinese in California," also "the more recent efforts in the United States Senate to induce the Government to modify the existing treaty with China." While there might be reason to question whether "being on the Pacific coast during the summer of 1875, and enjoying rare opportunities for gaining information," would furnish sufficient data for a "critical inquiry and study," yet the merit of the book does not depend on the author's acquaintance with the Chinese people. This fact the scope of the book, as given in the opening chapter, makes evident:

> The position we are compelled to take, however, is this: unless there should be such a radical reconstruction of the entire genius of our American Republican institutions as to make our national policy, if not our entire body politic, essentially and fundamentally different from what it has been during the past century, then it is simply impossible for our Government to say to any foreign people, "You are interdicted, and cannot dwell within our borders."

The argument in support of the above proposition is equally good whether you substitute for the words "foreign people" Chinese, Negroes, Dutch, or Swedes. We commend the book to those orators who are declaiming so loudly against Chinese immigration, and who are calling on Congress to enact a law for its prohibition.

The second book, by Rev. O. Gibson, who, since its publication, has been made a doctor by Allegheny College, his Alma Mater, was evidently written in the heat of the struggle which the presence of the Mongolian race has created on the Pacific coast, and in which he has borne a noble part, and bears throughout a savor of the indignation the writer feels at the wrongs inflicted on the Chinese by the venal officials and lower classes of San Francisco. It contains a just and candid estimate of the Chinese people, and at the same time a faithful history of recent events, that might properly be bound in the same volume with a history of the Thugs of India, or of the first ten years of Spanish intercourse with the natives of the West Indies. The impression which these outrages have made upon the Chinese themselves may be gathered from a single sentence taken from an appeal to the citizens of San Francisco, wherein the Chinese say: "If these enactments are the legitimate offspring of the American civilization and the Jesus religion, you can hardly wonder if the Chinese people are somewhat slow to embrace the one or to adopt the other."

We propose to examine some of the statements of these volumes, especially of the latter, and also to present some thoughts awakened by them on the general subject. We turn first to a remark of Dr. Gibson:—"They have always discouraged emigration from their own shores, and have been constantly and bitterly opposed to every attempt by outside nations to settle among them."—P. 29.

Dr. Gibson has, we think, been led into error on this point, the truth being that the rigid exclusiveness of China is of recent date, both as respects foreigners and their religions. We have records* of a very ancient intercourse between China and the nations of Central and Western Asia; also with Rome in the days of her pride, and even with Arabia. Caravans passed and repassed; imperial embassies came and went. The Jews found a home in China as early at least as 250 B. C. A synagogue existed until quite recently, and a few of the people yet remain who keep the Sabbath, and are known among the Chinese by the name Tiau-kin-kiau—the sect which plucks out the sinew. There are also evidences of the colonization of the Chi-

* See Hunt's "Library of Commerce," vol. i.

nese at a remote period. In the Chow Dynasty, beginning 1000 B. C., a company of Chinese settled in Borneo, and when the Portuguese discovered that island, in A. D. 1526, they were practically, though not nominally, the rulers of the island. Several other islands off the coast, such as Formosa and Celebes, have been visited by colonies of Chinese, who have been either exterminated or swallowed up. Buddhism was introduced into China in the first century, and, though a foreign religion, was not only welcomed, but was first introduced through an embassy sent by the Emperor Ming to India, who returned with some priests and images of Buddha. In the fourth century, and from that time on to the eighth, streams of pilgrims passed over the Himalayas to India, the Mecca of Buddhism, and Hindu Buddhists were in high favor in China as priests and teachers of the new religion.

We find in the writings of Marco Polo * continued evidences of the absence of the exclusive spirit which now characterizes the Chinese. During the reign of Kublai and Mongoo Khans complete toleration was granted to all religions, and honors were impartially bestowed upon men of every faith. Marco Polo was himself in high favor, though a foreigner and a Roman Catholic, and Mohammedans were numerous and freely employed. There is evidence that Christianity gained a feeble foothold in China more than a thousand years ago, and was then more favorably received than now. A stone tablet was found by the Jesuits in the seventeenth century showing the presence of Nestorian Christians in the country as early as A. D. 636, and their success in spreading Christianity; and there are imperial edicts in its favor of dates between that year and A. D. 782, which are still preserved in the archives and histories of China. We learn from the Mohammedan travelers, some of whom visited China as early as A. D. 850, that when Canton was taken and sacked by a rebel army A. D. 877, as many as 120,000 Mohammedans, Jews, Christians, and Parsees perished in the sack. These facts point to the prevalence of a far more liberal spirit than now exists.

The entire seclusion of the sovereign, and his refusal to receive foreign embassadors except on most humiliating conditions, was not so marked in the past. An embassy sent by

* See "Political and Social Condition of China, Tartary, and Thibet."—*Prinsip.*

Peter the Great, of Russia, in 1692, had an audience with the emperor, and partook of a banquet in his presence. The same was repeated in 1719. As late as the beginning of the present century there is an amusing account of the audience of M. Titsingh and M. Von Broam, Russian embassadors, with the old emperor, Kien Loong, who not only ate with them, but himself offered them wine.

The great wall which stretches along the northern border of China, and which is supposed to furnish proof of the existence of an exclusive spirit in the remote past, was simply a vast military fortification to keep out the wild tribes which were a terror to the whole country north of the Yang-tse-kiang. Although there may have been a national bias toward an exclusive policy, born of ignorance and conceit, yet that policy was not matured and settled till in modern times. China had little intercourse with the rest of the world, because she was shut in by natural and almost impassable barriers of mountains and deserts.

It is easy to trace the causes which led to the adoption of an exclusive policy. A history of the first two hundred years of intercourse between European nations and China is sufficient. As a whole, it is a record that for the credit of our modern civilization we might wish to leave in obscurity. But though we may wish to forget it, the Chinese nation will not. The leaders in the scenes of pillage and wanton destruction which characterized those days were the Portuguese.* We might think the accounts exaggerated did we not know of similar deeds in the intercourse of that nation and Spain with the American aborigines. A Chinese historian, putting the case very mildly, says: "They arrive in the river with ships of war, which beat our navy, sinking and burning many of our ships; they batter down our castles, taking our great men prisoners, and demean themselves altogether more like devils than men."

In 1573 the Chinese, as if to show their loathing of the strangers who had taken up their abode at Macao, built a barrier wall entirely across the isthmus on which the town stands. The Dutch early gained an almost equally unenviable reputation among the Chinese. It is a significant fact that the first known intercourse between England and China was in

* See Bowra's "History of the Quang Tung Province."

1605, when Sir E. Michelbourne, who had a patent for trading in the Eastern seas, met with and plundered several valuable Chinese junks. While the early intercourse of the English with the Chinese was not marked by such flagrant wrongs as characterized the Dutch and Spanish, yet that their deeds will not bear investigation is evident from an edict issued by the Chinese Government in 1637, strictly prohibiting all trade with them, while at the same time trade was allowed with the Dutch, provided that in every case they could give satisfactory assurance that they were not English. Whatever may have been the special part which each of these nations took in the dark transactions of those days it is certain that their combined course led directly to the policy of exclusion and non-intercourse of which we so much complain. During the last quarter of the last century and the first quarter of the present foreigners could not obtain even a temporary residence in China, except a few Romish priests, whom not even the fear of death could keep out; and, with the exception of a small colony of Chinese who left for Singapore, and the migration of persecuted Christians to Mongolia and Thibet, few Chinese left their own land.

Again we quote from Dr. Gibson, and this time with hearty concurrence :—"Even in these our days the Chinese have entered into friendly relations with other nations simply because they have been compelled to do so."—P. 29.

The incidents of the opium war, which ended in the advance on the metropolis, the sacking of the summer palace, and the treaty of Tientsin, are familiar to most readers. That treaty was ratified by the Chinese Government only when its armies were defeated, and every device that diplomacy could suggest had been exhausted. Though compelled to enter into a free intercourse with other nations, the policy of the Government has not changed.

W. H. Medhurst, Her British Majesty's Consul at Shanghai, in a recent work,* says :—

> There have been those who have asserted from high places and in authoritative style that the Chinese desire progress, and many English and American newspapers have echoed the sentiment; but it is a mistake, and those who initiated the cry too readily allowed

* "The Foreigner in Far Cathay." New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

their eyes to be blinded to the fact that it was a mistake. One has only to live among the people, to correspond and converse with the mandarins, and to study the numerous memorials addressed to the throne by leading statesmen, to convince one's self that, however much portions of the trading section of the population would like to see foreign relations extended, the ruling powers deprecate progress for its own sake. Even at the slowest rate of advance . . . the ruling and influential classes still only tolerate our presence in the country, and I firmly believe they would hail the day when they could see the last foreign factory razed to the ground, and the last ship dismissed the coast.

It might be inferred that while the ruling classes continue in this spirit no considerable emigration can take place from China. Such appears to be the conclusion of Dr. Gibson :—"Up to the present time, then, there certainly seems to be no real cause of alarm on account of the extent or rapidity of the Chinese immigration. If there is any cause for alarm, and we will not deny that there may be, the danger is entirely prospective and contingent, not present and certain."—P. 22.

But the facts will not sustain the inference, the truth being that, considering the shortness of time since the Chinese were allowed to go abroad, their almost total ignorance of other lands, and the settled opposition of the Government and ruling classes to any foreign intercourse, the emigration from China has already been large. One of the most satisfactory chapters in Dr. Gibson's book is that which treats of the number of Chinese in America. The most vague and extravagant notions have prevailed on this subject. Alarmists have not failed to make use of our ignorance, and have set its numbers at a figure which harmonized with their excited fancies. We have to thank Mr. Gibson for setting this question at rest. His data are drawn from three separate sources, which substantially agree, and may, therefore, be presumed to be correct. In 1870 Professor Porter was requested by the Bureau of Education at Washington to prepare an article on this subject. According to his statistics there were at that date less than one hundred thousand Chinese in the United States. Adding to this the number which, according to Custom-house statistics have since arrived, and deducting a fair percentage for deaths and returns to China, there remain about one hundred and fifty thousand. Again, we have statistics made up entirely from the Custom-house Records :—

TOTAL ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES FROM 1852 TO 1876.

| Year. | Arrived. | Departed. | Year. | Arrived. | Departed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1852 | 20,026 | 1,768 | 1865 | 3,095 | 2,295 |
| 1853 | 4,270 | 4,421 | 1866 | 2,242 | 3,111 |
| 1854 | 16,084 | 2,339 | 1867 | 4,290 | 4,475 |
| 1855 | 3,329 | 3,473 | 1868 | 11,081 | 4,210 |
| 1856 | 4,807 | 3,028 | 1869 | 14,990 | 4,895 |
| 1857 | 5,924 | 1,939 | 1870 | 10,870 | 4,230 |
| 1858 | 5,427 | 2,542 | 1871 | 5,540 | 3,260 |
| 1859 | 3,175 | 2,450 | 1872 | 9,770 | 4,899 |
| 1860 | 7,341 | 2,090 | 1873 | 17,075 | 6,805 |
| 1861 | 8,430 | 3,580 | 1874 | 16,085 | 7,710 |
| 1862 | 8,175 | 2,792 | 1875 | 18,021 | 6,365 |
| 1863 | 6,432 | 2,494 | 1876, first quarter. | 5,065 | 625 |
| 1864 | 2,682 | 3,910 | Total | 214,226 | 90,089 |

The number of Chinese in California before this estimate began was about ten thousand. Many have since died, and about an equal number have landed at other ports, or failed to be reported to the Custom-house authorities, which leaves the present number less than one hundred and forty thousand. Again, we have the records of the Chinese "Six Companies," according to which the number in America up to April 1, 1876, was as follows: Ning Yung Company, 75,000; Hop Wo Company, 34,000; Kong Chow Company, 15,000; Yung Wo Company, 12,000; Sam Yup Company, 11,000; Yan Wo Company, 4,300; Total, 151,300. These are all from one corner of the empire, and mainly from a single province.

The limits which the author had set in his book would not allow him to speak of the emigration of the Chinese to other countries than America. But those who have come to us are few compared with the number who have left China during the past twenty-five years. There has been a constant stream of migration southward. A recent traveler says: "To the casual observer Singapore looks more Chinese than Malayan, and really is, so as far as the population is concerned."* At Penang, in the Straits of Malacca, nearly one half the population is Chinese. They carry on most of the important branches of trade, and are the most successful traders and toilers in those islands. In Perak the tin mines are entirely in their hands. As far as the confines of India, and even in India, the Chinese are found.

They have gone to Australia in considerable numbers, where their influence is sensibly felt in the labor market. They are

* "The Land and People of China." J. Thompson, F.R.G.S.

rapidly taking the place of the vanishing Sandwich Islanders, and own and carry on some of the largest and most successful plantations in the Islands. There are six thousand Chinese residents in that little group. They have taken up their abode in parts of South America.* The Guano Islands, off the coast of Peru, are inhabited, so far as they are occupied at all, by the Chinese. In 1870† there were in the single Island of Cuba seventy thousand Chinese. It is probable that the cruelties practiced upon them in that unhappy island have reduced the number somewhat, but it is still considerable. The emigration to these various lands, which in the aggregate is not small, is but a tithe of that which has gone northward and westward into Thibet, Mongolia, Tartary, and the Russian settlements on the Amoor. Taking into account the attitude of the Chinese Government, the extreme ignorance of the masses of its people concerning other lands, and their marked partiality for their own, and, withal, the shortness of time since intercourse with modern nations really began, it is surprising that the emigration has been so large, and that it has taken so wide a range. It is prophetic, also, of the future.

Dr. Gibson says, though we shall not hold him responsible for all the meaning which we put into the passage:—"The few thousands of European and American merchants and missionaries now in China, and the one hundred and fifty thousand Chinese now in America, are but the beginnings of mighty changes about to take place in the history of that wonderfully strange people."—P. 28.

Observant men who have had opportunity to see the inner workings of Chinese society have thought that they discerned the presence of influences that are acting among the Chinese toward the same end, and in much the same manner as the silent forces in the bosom of the glacier, which push the accumulated snow of centuries down the mountain gorges out into the sea. Some of these forces have been a long time at work; others are of more recent origin, while *all* are acting with increased power from year to year.

* 197,000 had left China for that country up to 1870.

† It is difficult to see how this statement can be true, since there are records of the shipment of 130,900 Chinese to Cuba. Scarcely any are known to have returned, and it is improbable that so large a number has died. See "Chinese Immigration." Conwell, p. 92.

We propose next to speak of some of the conditions of Chinese society which point toward a large increase of emigration from that country.

Naturally enough, we consider, first, what must be the ultimate tendency of the increasing poverty of the Chinese masses. It is true, China has always been regarded as a country of great wealth. Marco Polo, in his day, brought back most extravagant tales of the almost unbounded riches of the natives of Cathay. The oft-repeated statement that China had attained to a high degree of perfection in the arts and sciences while most other nations were barbarous, has helped to perpetuate the misconception. It is but fair in making up a judgment of the circumstances of a people to have reference to the condition of the masses rather than that of the exceptional few. On this basis there can be but one opinion. Oriental lands in general are noted for the immense distance in point of wealth and station between the higher and lower classes, and China is no exception. There are princes in wealth, though their number is smaller than in western lands, while the great masses of the people are poor. The traveler who has visited the crowded cities of Europe finds on entering a Chinese city a *stratum* of society more pitiable than any he has before seen. He cannot but unfavorably contrast the condition of the peasant population with the same classes in Europe, and this whether he consider their homes, dress, food, or social surroundings. An expensive and heartless Government joins hands with corrupt systems of religion in further impoverishing the people. Moreover, poverty is on the increase. Of this there is not only abundant proof, but satisfactory explanation as to the causes.

The growing prevalence of the opium habit has had a part in the impoverishment of the people. There must be something in the constitution of the Chinese or in their climate that predisposes them to this habit, for while opium was almost unknown in that country one hundred years ago, it is now all but universal. It has been estimated that among Government officials forty per cent. are opium smokers, twenty per cent. of the merchants, seventy or eighty per cent. of the attendants of mandarins, and fifty per cent. of the fighting soldiery.

A Jesuit priest, who, in 1856, when opium smoking was less common than now, passed from Thibet directly through China,

said: "During the whole of the journey we met with but one tribunal where opium was not smoked openly and with impunity." It is asserted that there is an opium shop in the imperial palace at Peking, at the very foot of the Dragon Throne. Whatever may be said as to the influence of this habit in the direction of health and morals—and there are conflicting opinions—none can doubt that it is a costly vice. Large cities abound in victims of this habit, who have been reduced from at least comfortable circumstances to want and beggary. There is a single port on the Yang-tse-kiang river where three days out of every week there are landed one hundred and thirty chests of India opium, each chest valued at about six hundred and fifty dollars.* When we consider that this two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per week must be drawn from men who receive on an average fifteen cents for a day's labor, many of whom, having once become victims of the habit, must have means for its gratification at any sacrifice, we can understand the misery which follows in the wake of this trade. The Government derives a large revenue from the duties on opium, but it is at the expense of making paupers of many of the people.

Much of the destitution among the people may be traced to the series of bloody uprisings and rebellions which have followed one another in rapid succession during the last twenty-five years. The history of the Tai-ping rebellion, which, starting among the mountains of Kwang Tung, in 1850, spread like a consuming fire over all the southern and central provinces, has yet to be written. Enough is now known to establish the fact that it was one of the most sanguinary civil wars of which we have any knowledge. The chief theater of the war was the valley of the Yang-tse-kiang, which is the heart and garden of the empire. The rebel and imperial forces passed up and down this beautiful valley like hordes of devouring locusts, though, unlike them, destroying what they could not eat, always leaving behind them ruined cities, depopulated districts, and barren wastes. It is estimated that thirty millions of the inhabitants were either slain in battle or perished in the famine

* This was the case in 1870, since which time there has been a decrease in the amount of opium imported on account of the increased cultivation of the poppy and enlarged production of opium in the western provinces of China.

that followed on the heels of the war. The loss of life was exceeded only by the incalculable destruction of property.

An English traveler,* passing up the valley some years subsequent to the close of the war, says of Nankin—and the same may be said of scores of other cities :—

Ten years after this dreadful episode Nankin was yet in ruins. Acres upon acres of streets, once busy and teeming with thousands of industrious citizens, stretched out within the walls like grass mounds, hushed, desolate, and overgrown with rank weeds. Here and there faint, as if still pursued by dark memories, the hum of reawakening life might be heard, mingled with the fitful sounds of laborers and builders at the task of reconstructing. Outside, the deserted plains, where little else but reeds and grass were to be seen, testified how completely the region had been depopulated. Fresh laborers had begun to pour in, and were settling like squatters on a new land.

The same author adds, concerning a city altogether unknown to the western world :—

Another instance of the havoc made by the Tai-ping rebellion is afforded by the city of Chung Chow, in the Fukien Province, and an instance by no means exceptional, as the ravages of the war extended far and wide all over the central provinces. It is stated on good authority that when Chung Chow fell into the hands of the rebels from six to seven hundred thousand men were killed or perished by disease.

The Tai-ping rebellion, which continued for fifteen years, was followed by the Mohammedan uprising in the North-west Provinces, which has not yet been quelled. Our information on this point is very limited ; but whether the rebel or imperial forces have the mastery, the people must suffer. Civil war has existed in some part of China for thirty years. Some provinces are in a chronic state of rebellion, while others are infested by bands of followers of the "lost cause," who vent their spite by plundering villages and hamlets.

Many of the people have been shut out from their former means of gaining a livelihood, or had their income greatly curtailed through the introduction of foreign machinery and foreign goods. This fact the Chinese themselves state in an appeal to the citizens of San Francisco, wherein they say :—

It is but fair to state that as much friction, if not more, is caused in China by the presence of foreigners than the Chinese are cre-

* J. Thompson, F.R.G.S., in "Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China," p. 85.

ating in this land. The declaimers against us because we supplant white laborers in this country ought to know, what is well known to all intelligent Chinamen, that the introduction of American and English steamers upon the rivers and coasts of China has thrown out of business a vast fleet of junks, and out of employment a whole army of men, larger in number than all the Chinese now in America.

The same is true of the introduction of foreign goods. Single-handed industry can never compete with machinery in either the quality of an article or its cost. If a Chinaman can buy a beautifully polished knife from the Sheffield works of England cheaper than a rough tool turned out on his neighbor's anvil, or a yard of cloth from English manufactories cheaper than from his neighbor, the weaver, he will certainly do so. W. H. Seward, in summing up the civilization of China, says: "Chinese industries proscribe invention." But Chinese thrift leads them to buy when it can be done to the best advantage. Western nations are taking advantage of this fact to dispose of their surplus of manufactured goods. A glance at the trade of China for the last twenty years will show that it has largely increased in both imports and exports, with this difference, that while the exports have been mainly commodities which do not come into competition with industries in the lands to which they are sent, the imports are largely of manufactured goods which come into competition with local industries. Hence the foreign trade is looked upon by many of the Chinese as a calamity, and, doubtless, it does result in deprivation and poverty in many quarters. These and many other causes are increasing the financial burdens of the people, and as the path across the sea becomes more and more known to them, will aid in sending large numbers of them abroad.

Another influence acting toward an increased emigration of the Chinese proceeds from the unsatisfactory political condition of the country, and the oppressions of the Government. On few subjects have such widely different things been written as concerning the Government of China. Some have seen in it a model Government, and have lauded it to the skies; others have been as loud in condemnation of its weakness and oppression. Both parties are correct, for one describes the theory of the Government as it is on the statute books, the other its practice. The theory of the Government and its code of laws

are such as to have awakened the admiration of the best statesmen of both England and America. The Government is patriarchal, and the laws, on the whole, are humane and just. The greatest care seems to have been taken to guard the people from oppression on the part of subordinates. As a *stimulus* and token of confidence in the people, the officers of Government are supposed to be invariably chosen from the graduates of the Imperial College, which is open to the poorest. To still further guard against corruption, no officer of rank can marry or hold office in his native province, and should not employ a relative in any position under him; and a magistrate is seldom kept in one position more than four years. The theory is a most excellent one: it has held the nation together and given it a lease of life far beyond that enjoyed by any other nation.

But when we come to the practical workings of the Government we must bate our admiration not a little. We must remember that it is a country vast as our own, and yet without telegraphs, railroads, and, till lately, without steamboats on its coast and rivers. The capital is situated in the northern corner of the empire, and when the laws get a thousand miles away they lose their authority. The people are practically in the hands of subordinate rulers, who, with small salaries, live like princes, and, if called to account for their oppressions of the people, depend on their distance from the capital and the venality of higher officers to help them out of the difficulty. Indeed, official corruption is a sort of recognized and well understood fact, arising partly from the inadequate pay of the mandarins, and partly from the mode of collecting and administering the revenue. A petty officer freely stated to Mr. Meadows that, though his legal income was but little more than one hundred dollars, yet his position was worth upward of ten thousand dollars. A court of justice in China is notoriously devoid of even a show of justice. The culprit brought for trial appears before the judge on his knees, and, without counsel to represent the case, or jury before whom to be tried, receives his sentence. A Chinaman dreads a summons before a court as he does a fearful sickness, and, whether right or wrong, knows that the easiest way out of the difficulty is by bribery. The same corruption exists in the administration of the affairs

of the Imperial College. Promotion is supposed to be had only on the ground of merit, the test of which is the production of a literary composition on the day of examination. Yet it is a notorious fact that degrees are now often conferred upon those who have not been at the examination, but have bought their way to position.

The history of one of the score or more of Chinese dynasties which in turn have ruled the people is the history of them all. They began in the direction of integrity and reform, but declined year by year, ending in corruption and misrule. The Tartar Dynasty has run its course, and reached its latter stages.* If the emperor be, as he is styled, Father of the People, he is a most heartless and unnatural one, or else is pitiably weak. In the famines, floods, pestilences, and local disturbances which have so frequently occurred among that unhappy people, the Government has rendered no substantial aid. One of the representatives of our Church in China, in a recent letter, says:—

> The famine in Shan-tung has destroyed many thousands, and is now followed by a pestilential fever that is carrying off thousands more. Locusts are devastating portions of Kiang-si, Ho-nan, Ngan-hwei, and other provinces. Great floods have done immense damage at Canton. The air in every direction seems heavily laden with calamitous tidings.

The attitude of the Government toward these sufferers is well described by Medhurst:—

> The supreme Government and local authorities at such conjunctures profess great concern for the sufferings of the people, and measures are set on foot at times on an extensive scale to organize schemes for relief, but inefficiency and corruption nearly always interfere to defeat the most beneficent intentions, and little or nothing is eventually effected beyond the bestowal, by imperial favor, of a new tablet upon a river god, or the offering of a special sacrifice to propitiate some deity supposed to be offended.

No sufficient protection is given the people against the robbers who, under the cloak of insurrection, infest many of the

* Traces are every-where to be seen upon the great thoroughfares of the elaborately constructed highways of better days, but they are now mere broken tracks, obstructed throughout much of their course by the very stones which once constituted the source of utility and beauty. Bridges, too, many of them admirable as works of art, and others curious from their rough and massive character, span wide and rapid streams, but, like every thing else in China, tell the same sad story of past energy and present decay.—*Medhurst.*

provinces. The imperial troops are as much an object of dread to the people as those whom they are sent to oppose. They have no sufficient means of support themselves, and must live on the people, who, rather than apply for help from that source, choose to suffer on in silence. Taking it altogether, we do not see how China can evade the charge of being the worst governed country in the world.* Oppression has often had a hand in scattering a people, as a history of the tyrannies of Europe will show, and when the door now closed by ignorance is fairly opened to the Chinese, it will not fail to do the same work there.

The religious condition of China is such that, though taken in itself its influence might be small, yet, when other influences take the lead, it will help to swell the number who take refuge abroad. Three great religious systems hold the Chinese mind in slavery, namely, those of Confucius, Buddha, and Lao-tse. With the exception of the *literati*, who are Confucianists, the people are not followers of any one of these religions, but have an eclectic system made up of elements from each. From the Confucian system they have borrowed that which has grown up alongside of it, the worship of ancestors; from the Buddhist a modified idea of transmigration of soul, and a large number of gods, and some humanitarian precepts; and from the Tauist most of all that is dark and mysterious in that system. Whatever may be said of these systems, and they each contain much that is excellent and true, the religious condition of the Chinese masses is most deplorable. As a whole, their strange compound of a religion appeals only to the element of fear. Their worship is, for the most part, a mere propitiation of angry gods and spirits. Superstition has a fair field among such a people, and does not fail to do its direful work. The result is an uneasy condition of society,† which inevitably tends

* See Williams' "Middle Kingdom," vol. i, p. 396.

† A letter, of which the following is an extract, was written by a Chinaman in California in reply to the question why the Chinese went abroad. It is given in the imperfect form in which it was written: "The difficulty which our king (we call him Woongtu in China) has with this part of our people is because they cannot understand. They think they have bad time in China, and some Nykoos (nuns) tells them there will come a famine soon time, and they frighten at it and say, 'How can we live? We have much family, and no rice, no fish.' Then they hear that they can come to this country and get pay. So they come. They think some time business will be better and the famine gone. Then in China they get strange ideas that make them uneasy and want to go away. They expect to see

to increase the power and importance of whatever movements arise among the people.

J. Thompson, F. R. G. S., a veteran English traveler, closes an exceedingly interesting book on "The Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China," with the following sentences:—

> The picture, at best, is a sad one, and though a ray of sunlight may brighten it here and there, yet, after all, the darkness that broods over the land becomes but the more palpable under the struggling, fitful light. Poverty and ignorance we have among us in England, but no poverty so wretched, no ignorance so intense, as is found among the millions of China.

Such are some of the conditions of Chinese society which furnish a basis for the belief in an increase of Chinese emigration.

On the supposition that such an exodus is possible, and even probable, let us consider the grounds, if any exist, for the fear that has taken possession of so many minds lest we should be overwhelmed in what may be a second "Barbarian Irruption."

The reasons alleged in justification of the cry against Chinese immigration are the numbers of that people, and our inability to support large numbers or supply them with labor. Objections are also brought against the character of the people as immoral and vicious, and against their civilization as barbarous, also against their religions as tending to corrupt our purer Christianity. It is obvious that if any valid objections exist, they must be either on account of the character of the immigrants or their numbers.

As to the fear that we shall be overwhelmed by mere numbers, it has its origin largely in the imagination. Movements among any Oriental people must be necessarily slow. Means of communication among the people are very imperfect. Light penetrates the masses very tardily. The people as a whole know little of their own country out of their native province,

in China all slaves and no rice at all, which would be sad. They tell me strange stories about their seeing Buddha with a great sword from horizon to horizon, and that they find blood in the clothes when they wash, and that they see China sometimes in the sky with a great smoke under it. All much fearful, and so they don't go back when ready. They ask the shang-shang, (god,) and he wont say yes or no, so they think he don't want to tell. You must not think any thing of it, for they are poor and not knowing. I cannot think many of them here came because they not liked China. They want money, and a place where they do not frighten."—*Conwell, Chinese Immigration, p.* 42.

much less of lands beyond the sea. And, unless such a famine should visit China as was felt in Ireland in 1846, which so greatly stimulated emigration from that country—a supposition that is extremely improbable because of the variety of the resources of China—no such overwhelming numbers may be expected.

But should the expectations of the most fearful be realized, the result would still be not an unmixed evil. In that event it is probable that the tides of emigration would set toward the same lands that have already been occupied by small numbers, namely, North and South America, Australia, the Sandwich Islands, the East Indies, and the countries bordering on China toward the north and west.

Let us inquire as to the ability of those countries to support a larger population than they now contain.

As to the United States, we quote from Dr. Townsend, who refers us to Rev. Joseph Cook as his authority:—

> The extent of the arable soil of the United States transcends conception. It is more than that of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined. It is so immense that should China empty her five hundred millions of people upon our shores, (of which there is no danger,) we could still find room for more; according to the estimates of those who have given attention to these matters, our country has ample capacity for thirty-six hundred millions of human beings, a number five times greater than the present population of the globe. Who are we, therefore, that we should block our ports, put down fence posts, and interdict immigration to these favorite and vast domains?

The center of this vast area is practically uninhabited. Texas, with an area of 237,500 square miles, has a population of a million; Washington Territory, with 70,000 square miles, has only one inhabitant to every two square miles, while its vast regions are occupied only by the buffalo and the Indian. Most of the Western States and Territories have issued at public expense works descriptive of the resources of their several sections, which need only an industrious population to develop into mines of wealth. Many of them have appointed agents to secure immigration to their respective States. From whence are the people to come to cultivate these vast regions? The immigration from Europe has almost ceased.* Unless there be an

* The Catholic World, July, 1877, in an article on the European Exodus, says: "The great wave of immigration began to rise in 1840, reached its highest point

influx of patient toilers from the Orient, the next half century will find these resources yet undeveloped.

South America has an area of 6,600,000 square miles, and a population of less than twenty millions of people. Most of that vast region is yet virgin soil. The people are not over-industrious, and the resources of the country not much more developed than they were a quarter of a century ago. There is little reason to look for greater progress in the future. We can imagine the change that would come over that land should Providence send there in large numbers that people whose name is a synonym for industry and thrift.

Australia has an area of three millions of square miles, and a population of little more than one million. The interior, for the most part, has never even been explored. It lacks but one element to insure its becoming a great country and nation, and that need is people of industrious habits.

The Sandwich Islands are too small to be taken into the account when speaking of such vast countries as America and Australia; but, small as they are, they seem destined to become the future abode of many thousands of Chinese, who are taking the place of the vanishing native race.

Thibet, Tartary, and Mongolia, while not so fertile, are less distant, and will continue to furnish homes for hundreds of thousands of Chinese in the future as they have done in the past.

No doubt, in the event of a large immigration to any of these countries, there would be some friction, and some classes for the time being would be inconvenienced and suffer loss; but, looking at the subject simply from an industrial stand-point, no loss would be sustained by the world in general, or the Anglo-Saxon race in particular.

Stronger objections to the immigration of the Chinese are supposed to exist on the ground of the evil effects that will ensue on the introduction of a large heathen element into any of these countries.

in 1869–72, and, notwithstanding some fluctuations, continued to bring to our shores a colony a day until 1875. In that year it experienced a sudden and serious check, and has ever since steadily subsided, until now it has not only sunk to a low water-mark, but has seemed to be about to flow the other way. . . . The whole number of steerage emigrants from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland which landed at New York during the year was 20,064, a much smaller number than arrived in any previous year since 1840.

Dr. John Foster, in his volume of admirable essays, refers to the frequency with which men apply epithets to classes of persons against whom they are prejudiced, epithets of which the users would be at a loss to explain the meaning were they called upon to do so. He says in the way of illustration :—

Puritan was doubtless welcomed as a term most luckily invented or revived when it began to be applied in contempt to a class of men of whom the world was not worthy. Its odd peculiarity gave it almost such an advantage as that of a proper name among the lumber of common words by which they were described and reviled; while yet it meant any thing, every thing, which the vain world disliked in the devout and conscientious character. . . . The vain and malignant spirit which had decried the elevated piety of the Puritans, sought about for some convenient form in which it might again come forth to hiss at zealous Christianity, and in another lucky moment fell on the term *Methodist*. If there is no *sense* in the word as now applied, there seems, however, to be a good deal of aptitude and execution. It has the advantage of being comprehensive as a general denomination, and yet opprobrious as a special badge for every thing that ignorance and folly may mistake for fanaticism or that malice may willfully assign to it. Whenever a formalist feels it his duty to sneer at those operations of religion on the passions by which he has never been disturbed, he has only to call them *Methodistical;* and though the word be so trite and so vague, he feels as if he had uttered a good, pungent thing. There is a satirical smartness in the word, though there be none in the man. In default of keen faculty in the mind, it is delightful thus to find something that will do as well ready bottled up in odd terms.

The same remarks are applicable with reference to the use of the word *heathen*, which means, in the root, one who lives in the country, or on the heaths. In somewhat of the same spirit of the Jew, who called all except his own people Gentiles, or the Mohammedan, who applied the epithet *infidel*, to all except followers of the Koran, we have used the term *heathen*. In the sense of not being acquainted with revealed religion, and of accepting very tardily offers of Christian light and instruction, the Chinese are certainly heathen. But when the word is meant to cover the charge of groveling vice and degradation, such as would pollute our civilization by its very touch, it is a misnomer.* The writer of the introduction to Dr. Gib-

* Father Huchard, the most prominent Jesuit priest on the Pacific coast, said in an address concerning the Chinese: "These pagan, these vicious, these immoral creatures, that are incapable of rising to the virtue that is inculcated by the religion of Jesus Christ, the world's Redeemer."

son's book remarks of the author: "I am inclined to think that he has drawn the faults of the pagan strangers a little more strongly than their virtues." The same statement may be made with reference to the light in which the entire heathen world has been portrayed to the nations of Christendom in the past. Men have persisted in looking at pagan nations through the glass of the first chapter of the Book of Romans. And since one can see almost any thing among a people if he sets out with a preconceived opinion, and a resolution to preserve it intact, our missionaries in the past have seen among the heathen mainly vices. But juster and more impartial views are beginning to prevail. We are coming to see in the first chapter of Romans a description of every heart by nature.* We are coming to admit not only that the heathen have the guide of conscience and reason, but also that the Spirit of grace is not confined to so-called Christian lands, but "lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and that it is possible that some fruit of the Spirit may be found amid the darkness of heathenism. We are coming to look with at least a little favor on such statements as the following, made by one who was for two years a resident at the Court of Siam:—

> I was thankful to find even in this citadel of Buddhism men and, above all, women who were lovely in their lives; who amid infinite difficulties in the bosom of corrupt society, and enslaved to a capricious and often cruel will, yet devoted themselves to an earnest search after truth. On the other hand, I have to confess, with sorrow and shame, how far we, with all our boasted enlightenment, fall short in true nobility and piety of some of our benighted sisters of the East. With many of them love, truth, and wisdom are not mere synonyms, but *living gods*, for whom they long, with lively ardor, and, when found, embrace with joy.†

The sooner we disabuse our minds of the impression that in dealing with the heathen world we are dealing with a state of society utterly degraded, where moral obligation is nothing, and where impurity causes no blush, and awakens no condemnation, the sooner we shall rightly estimate the true condition of those to whom our missionaries are sent. It is generally the case, when the limits of truth have been exceeded in the statement of any subject, in the recoil which ultimately fol-

* See Introduction to Cocker's "Christianity in the Greek Philosophy."

† "English Governors at the Court of Siam," by Mrs. Leonowens.

lows the bounds of truth are again transgressed, though in the opposite direction. We notice such a tendency in current estimates of heathen society and civilization. Ethnic religions are the objects of special praise in some quarters, and heathen civilization is deemed of great excellence. As usual, *in medio tutissimus ibis.* The impartial student of pagan religions, as well as the unbiased traveler in the lands where they prevail, will find much to condemn, and something to praise. In its moral and social aspects, heathen society is to many a matter of surprise. We recently asked of one who for the last ten years has resided in the heart of one of the largest of so-called heathen cities the following question: "How does the society of the city in which you have lived in its moral aspects compare with our own?" His reply, which was given after deliberation, was as follows: "Very favorably. There are not so many murders or suicides, no more thefts, and those generally on a small scale, no drunkenness, and not so much licentiousness, in that city as your own." That judgment, formed not by a flying visit, but by years of observation, is the verdict of not a few of those who live within the bounds of heathendom. Exception may be made as to parts of Africa, Australia, and some of the islands of the Pacific; but of India, the Malayan Peninsula, China, and Japan, which represent immense territories, and more than one half the race, the above statement is true. It would be easy to gather testimony from such men as the Abbé Huc, Captain Forbes, who resided eleven years in Ceylon, Vincent,* author of the Land of the White Elephant, as well as a host of consular agents, merchants, and missionaries. Consul Medhurst, in a work already referred to, says: "Indeed, were I asked to state candidly in which part of the world I thought the effects of vicious indulgences are more outwardly observable, socially speaking, I certainly should not name China."

Not only has the heathen world improved on a better acquaintance, but China, in which we are most directly interested, is the best part of that world. The institutions of China will compare favorably with those of any non-christian country

* This author makes the following statement of the city of Bangkok, which has a population of 400,000: "Thefts are not so frequent here as in England, and cases of murder so seldom that for a year sometimes there will not be one."

The Government of China, though now a sorry sight under the waning power of the Manchoos, yet as a whole, and especially during the past, stands out in marked contrast with those of other pagan nations. Religion in China is devoid of those revolting features which too often characterize heathen systems. The Chinese as a people will compare favorably with either the Hindus, Birmese, Siamese, or Japanese. Though not such adepts in misty speculation as the first, or so enthusiastic over every thing new and foreign as the last, yet, in all the elements necessary to make up a steady, sober, and industrious people, just such as the vast undeveloped resources of the western world need, they excel. Dr. Gibson says:—

> History teaches the impossibility of continuing in *statu quo* for a long period two distinct and often conflicting forms of civilization under one and the same government, in the same country, and at the same time. Constant contact, mutual friction, a better acquaintance with each other, always modifies the point of difference, and tends gradually to bring the two distinct forms of civilization into one. The tendency of the lower, according to its measure of power, is to corrupt, weaken and poison the higher and better; while it is the tendency of the higher and better, according to its measure of power, to arouse, vitalize, energize, purify, and uplift the lower and decaying.—P. 126.

We believe that when that day comes, when the paths across the ocean are better known to the people of the Orient, and thousands more of them escape from the poverty, the bondage and tyrannies of those old lands, as fifty years ago men did from Europe, Christianity will be found true to herself and her past record, and, as the "higher and better," which she unquestionably is, will "arouse, vitalize, energize, purify, and uplift the lower and decaying."

---

## Art. V.—THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN POLITICS.

The great nation known as the United States of America was originally established by the offspring of rare and cultured families, gathered from different parts of Europe, who were imbued with purest principles, and were wise far above their fellows in political knowledge. The oft-repeated assertion, "They

builded wiser than they knew," is an exceedingly questionable one. In those days the ablest men of the provinces sat in the public councils, and their writings and debates prove that they had thoroughly studied the science of government, and foresaw in an unusual degree the consequences of their action. In Europe society had long groaned under an excess of government; the founders of the new nation resolved to give it as little government as possible. All the monarchies of the ages had practiced more or less of despotism; all the republics and confederations had been so feebly constructed as to tempt anarchy, which had proved the ruin of most of them. The military struggles of our Revolutionary fathers were not half so distinguished as their moral achievements in the origination of a new and peerless system of national administration. Their armies were not great nor their bravery conspicuous. Their success in the field sprang from geographical location, the support of powerful allies, and a favoring Providence. But while the country was poor in military education and equipments, it was rich in the principles of human liberty, and in that rare wisdom needful to mold them into appropriate legislative and administrative forms. The government of the country, as well as its settlement, began in the townships, and expanded gradually into cities and States, which were at length grouped into a federal union. The principles of "State sovereignty" were cultivated legitimately, therefore, before the federal nation existed, and they have lived to somewhat disturb the national tranquility through its first century.

The close of the war for independence in 1783 found the thirteen colonies impoverished to bankruptcy, and utterly disjointed and chaotic in government. The federal league, adopted in 1778, was an indifferent bond of union during the war, and fell hopelessly in pieces on the cessation of hostilities. The Continental Congress kept up a kind of existence, but was powerless as an agent of government. Its members failed to attend, and its acts were inoperative in the States until approved by the Legislatures of the States, seven of which must concur before any of its measures were valid. When the public danger was removed by the withdrawal of the British troops, the revenues were withheld by the States, and the dwindling Congress, as a central government, was paralyzed. It had

and could secure no income to liquidate the public debt, or pay its interest. Its securities depreciated to less than a tenth of their nominal value, and its soldiers were unpaid. America was at last free, but she had neither respect abroad nor tranquillity at home. Great Britain intercepted her lucrative trade with the West Indies, Spain resisted her right to navigate the Mississippi, while in the Mediterranean and adjacent waters her ships were plundered by the pirates of Algiers. Indian depredations were common along her frontiers. Jealousies between the States, lack of confidence attending the financial prostration, and widespread dissatisfaction, culminating in Shay's rebellion, aroused the statesmanship of the country. To organize for internal and external protection became an imperative necessity. The several colonies were invited by the Legislature of Virginia to send representatives to a general convention, and in May, 1787, the fifty-five chosen delegates convened in Philadelphia, where they continued until September in secret session, with George Washington as President, and matured what has since been known as the "Constitution of the United States of America." This Constitution, adopted by the States in 1789, has since received fifteen amendments.

The newly organized American Government began its modest career under the eyes of friendly and hostile critics, who uttered nearly every variety of hope and prediction concerning it. Hamilton, one of the chief agents in its formation, a great statesman, and a friend of a strong Government, thought the present form too weak, but as he could carry the country no further he accepted it, with misgivings. Jefferson, the greatest and best Democrat of the century, thought the system adopted too strong, and lived in continual horror of an incoming monarchy. For many years the factions in the nation followed substantially the lead of these two men. Washington was inaugurated President on April 30, 1789, on the balcony of the old City Hall, New York, near which he took up his modest residence, and proceeded to cautiously organize and administer the Government. Hamilton was appointed Secretary of the Treasury; Jefferson, Secretary of State; Knox, Secretary of War; Edmund Randolph, Attorney General; and John Jay, Chief-Justice of the United States. Every thing was new, and the greatest discretion was required to introduce, without fric-

tion, the principles and machinery of a strong central authority. The first Congress, which convened in January, 1790, found it incumbent to provide for national defense; to facilitate intercourse and commerce with foreign nations; to adopt a system of weights and measures, and a postal system; to encourage manufactures, agriculture, and education; to establish a currency; and last, though not least, to provide for the maintenance of the public credit. To this last measure, which most embarrassed the country, and was most difficult to handle, Washington had pledged his administration previous to his election. The Continental Congress had enjoyed the power of contracting debts, but held no control of the resources of the country to liquidate them. At the close of the Revolution the war debt amounted to forty-two millions, but this, through arrears of interest, etc., had increased to upward of fifty-four millions. Of this amount, eight millions were due to France, between three and four millions to private capitalists in Holland, two hundred and fifty thousand to some Spanish gentlemen, making about twelve millions due abroad. Forty-two millions were due at home to officers and privates of the army, and to farmers, manufacturers, and capitalists, who had patriotically risked life and fortune in the struggle for independence. Besides this general indebtedness, about twenty-five millions more were owed by the States, (half of that amount having been incurred by Massachusetts, Virginia, and South Carolina,) expended also in the common defense. Hamilton proposed that the Federal Government assume the entire war debt, and provide for its interest and liquidation. This very reasonable and only feasible method produced an intense political uproar, shaking the national fabric for an entire year, and threatening the dismemberment of the newly formed Union, and was the first great strain on our governmental system. After much debate and threatening, (the latter greatly mortifying Washington,) the measure passed by a small majority, under a compromise for the removal of the capital southward. The conclusion reached in that early crisis lifted the Federal Government into great prominence, and settled forever its competency to provide for national indebtedness, and to regulate finance. The funding of the war debt was the chief feature of Washington's first term. His second term brought its chapters of anxiety and mortification,

even greater than the first. He had been re-elected by the unanimous vote of the Electoral College, and felt not a little flattered by his continued popularity. The Revolution in France was already in progress; every mail brought an account of the fall of towns and the murder of citizens. The intelligence of the decapitation of Louis XVI. and of a declaration of war with England brought popular excitement in America to its highest pitch. Multitudes were ready to rush into war with England in the interests of France. Washington clearly perceived that in a foreign war America had nothing to gain, but much to lose. He, therefore, hastily convened his cabinet, and arranged a proclamation which he accompanied with measures of strict neutrality. But a few weeks after his second inauguration "Citizen Genet," the young Jacobin from the French Republic, landed at Charleston with three hundred blank commissions for privateers, which he began to distribute clandestinely to adventurous seamen. He was tardy in presenting his credentials to the Government, and, notwithstanding its proclamation, continued to send out vessels of war. He organized *Jacobin* clubs, sought to incite war between the people of the Southern States and the Spaniards of Louisiana, and, when remonstrated with by cabinet officials for these examples of misdemeanor, denounced the policy of the Government, and threatened to appeal from the President to the people. On Washington's demand the French Government promptly recalled him. But the populace here sided with Genet during that entire summer, to the infinite mortification of the President, who, in one of his cabinet meetings, lost all self-control, and declared that he would rather be in his grave than in his present position, adding that he had never repented but once his re-election, and that had been every moment since he consented to continue in office.

A treaty formed with Great Britain during this term also excited the wildest opposition, subjecting the President to nearly as great popular obloquy as any of his successors has ever been compelled to encounter. His national fame and great firmness held the warring factions together until the hour of reason returned. With a President less famous or practical the Republic would have stranded.

The administration of John Adams was a stormy one, grow-

ing out of the disturbed state of Europe, and of political jealousies at home, but it was not in any large sense an educating period to the American people. The seat of the National Government was removed to Washington, and the whole Federal party went into a hopeless decline, and virtually expired with his official term. The Democratic or State Rights party, headed by Jefferson, assumed control of the country on the elevation of their chief to the Presidency. Washington expired near the close of Adams's administration, and Hamilton was killed in a duel during Jefferson's first term, depriving the Federal party of its chief advisers and ornaments. Jefferson, while out of office, had lived in horror of the executive authority, and it is amusing to see how marvelously his views were modified when he came to administer the government. The abstract theories of individual and State rights he had so long advocated he appeared to find utterly untenable in practice. Instead of leaving Burr to the legal tribunal, he threw his entire official influence against him in his trial, and even counseled the indictment of his legal adviser as an accomplice. Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana was a magnificent stroke for the rising nation. The territory thus acquired for fifteen millions amounted to over nine hundred and thirty thousand square miles, and more than doubled the area of what was then the United States. But he had no authority as the Executive to make the purchase, and would have been appalled at such a stretch of power in other hands. The political education of the nation was, however, much advanced under Jefferson. The trial of Burr was a wholesome and far-reaching lesson to political chieftains; and the growing sentiment against the iniquitous African slave-trade crystallized into appropriate legislation for its suppression.

During the administration of President Madison came the short war with Algiers, and the second war with Great Britain, which latter cost the country thirty thousand lives, and one hundred millions of money; but, besides establishing our equality on the ocean, it did more for the military education of the nation than all the campaigns of the Revolution. The internal advantages to the American people growing out of that war were also of far greater importance than the concessions obtained from surrounding nations. Suspension of inter-

course with Europe stimulated domestic manufactures, and bequeathed to America the immense mill power of New England. That period settled also, as never before, the war power of the Federal Government. President Madison was not a soldier, and, as the country was destitute of both army and navy, he leaned to pacific measures, and hesitated long under British encroachments before deciding on armed resistance. War at length became inevitable. The country was large and feebly defended, and portions of it soon fell a prey to the enemy. New England, particularly, suffered in the destruction of her commerce and fisheries, and the wide-spread inroads upon her territory. Her people, too, were generally Federalists, and regarded the war as an ill-advised and unwarranted party measure of the Democrats. This led to the famous Hartford Convention of 1814, which arraigned the general Government for usurpation, in that it claimed power over the militia of the country, and the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by conscription, and in that it employed the revenue gathered in New England for the defense of other portions of the country. News concerning the negotiations for peace at Ghent reached the country soon after the adjournment of the Convention, and ended the practical discussion of these questions for that time. The Hartford Convention and its adherents fell into national disrepute, (its members being almost wholly excluded from political preferment,) and the war power of the Federal Government has never since been seriously questioned.

A new chapter in American politics opened about the year 1820. The long wars of the French Revolution, and the war with England, just mentioned, cutting off for years all free communication with Europe, gave rise to extensive manufactories in the Northern States. When peace was concluded the channels of international commerce were re-opened, and the fabrics of Europe sought the American market. To protect the incipient manufactures of the States, and also to provide revenue for the liquidation of the national indebtedness, a system of import duties was established by the Federal Government. This important measure, considered thoroughly statesmanlike at the North, was stoutly resisted at the South, which was devoted exclusively to agricultural pursuits. As early as 1820 South Carolina, in a petition to Congress, declared that the

tariff was "unconstitutional, oppressive, and unjust," and at subsequent periods North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and Virginia, joined in the remonstrance. During the summer of 1828 John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, then Vice-President of the United States, propounded the doctrine of *Nullification*, namely, the right of each State to prevent the execution within its limits of such acts of Congress as it might deem unconstitutional. In a speech in the United States Senate, in 1833, Mr. Calhoun uttered the following, which briefly presents the foundation for his entire theory: "The Constitution is a compact to which the States were parties in their sovereign capacity: now, whenever a contract is entered into by parties which acknowledge no tribunal above their authority to decide in the last resort, each of them has a right to judge for itself in relation to the nature, extent, and obligations of the instrument." This was substantially the principle of the old confederations, that had ruined so many republics, and which the framers of the Constitution had so carefully shunned in organizing the new nation. The Democratic party, save the South Carolina wing headed by Calhoun, supported President Jackson and the protective tariff. In 1832 the Legislature of South Carolina resolved to carry out its theory of nullification; to this end it armed the militia, and prepared for war. Jackson issued a proclamation declaring his purpose to collect the revenues in that State, and called upon Congress for some special legislation in the case. The storm was averted by the compromise bill introduced by Mr. Clay, which provided for the gradual reduction of the revenue, and the abandonment of the protective system at the end of ten years. The surrender on the part of the Federal Government in this instance was far too marked, and only flattered that spirit of State arroganee that burst forth thirty years later in a bloody civil war. The remarkable discussion on the subject, however, in the United States Senate, between Mr. Calhoun and Daniel Webster, the two profoundest men of the time, and the most remarkable representatives of Northern and Southern statesmanship, laying open every principle of our government, and exhausting every thread of argument, constitutes one of the most brilliant chapters in American politics. The lapse of nearly fifty years has not dimmed

the radiance of that period. The firmness of President Jackson, also, has ever been commended, and the authority of the Federal Government on all matters of tariff every-where acknowledged.

The doctrine of State Rights never took deep root in the Northern section of the Union, but continued popular in the South, cultivating in that section the spirit of disunion which finally culminated in the slaveholders' rebellion. The great battle covering the last half century of American history, taxing the intellect, the heart, and finally the purse, of the entire people, has been between the adherents of *slave* and of *free* labor. Slavery was here before the organization of the Governments of the States, and at the period of the Revolution the antislavery sentiment prevailed quite as generally at the South as in the North. The ordinance of 1787, excluding the institution from the North-Western territory, was chiefly supported by Southern men, and in 1798 Georgia prohibited the importation of slaves into the State. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, and, indeed, most of the leading statesmen at the formation of the Government, looked to the early emancipation of the slaves. After the organization of the Government the work of emancipation proceeded briskly in the Eastern and Middle States. Vermont abolished the system before entering the Union. Massachusetts (which then included Maine) did the same in 1780, as did also Pennsylvania by gradual emancipation, Connecticut and Rhode Island taking similar action. In 1804 New Jersey passed laws for the gradual release of her twelve thousand bondmen, and in 1827, the period of gradual emancipation adopted by New York, set free the last of her twenty thousand. That the spirit of emancipation did not prevail in the South is to be attributed to a variety of causes, but principally to the nature of its soil, climate, and productions, which soon rendered slave labor lucrative, and also to the Southern ideal of social life, which was reckoned genteel, chivalric, baronial.

The cotton plant was indigenous to the South. Cotton had been cultivated and manufactured in Mexico and Peru before the arrival of Columbus, but the labor of preparing it for market was so enormous that it made no perceptible addition to the world's commerce until after the American Revolution. Two

great inventions about that period were destined to bring this commodity into world-wide use, and to largely revolutionize the industry and commerce of the nations. The labor of separating the cotton from the seed was so difficult that not more than one pound per day could be prepared by a laborer; but in 1793 Eli Whitney, a New England inventor, produced the cotton gin, by which a laborer could prepare for market three hundred pounds *per diem*. The combined genius of Hargraves, Arkwright, and Crompton, in Old England, had just produced the improved spinning-jenny, making one operator, who had hitherto toiled with wheel and distaff, master of twenty-two hundred rapid spindles. Cotton at once became, in Southern parlance, "king," and this New England invention rendered it the most lucrative production of the Southern States, the volume of annual business in this single article rising in half a century to *two hundred millions of dollars*. The Southern intellect early conceived that a system of perpetual, menial, unrequited servitude, based on *color inferiority*, was indispensable to the prosperity of that portion of the Union, and to the culture and development of the white classes. The representatives of free labor in the North and those of slave labor in the South soon towered into stalwart political organizations, vigilant and sensitive. To keep up the equilibrium between these diverse interests in the general Government became the study of statesmen, and, when possible, States representing the two interests were admitted into the Union simultaneously, and when this could not be done some compensating legislation, called a "compromise," was frequently sought. In 1820 the United States Senate was so evenly balanced between these interests that it became an absorbing question whether Missouri should reinforce the one or the other. The South prevailed, forcing upon the North a "compromise" providing that slavery should never be permitted north of the parallel of 36° 30′. As the territory lying north of that line comprised most of the nation's unoccupied domain, the theater of future States, it was soon discovered that that "compromise" had doomed the supremacy of the slave power. To save itself, the slave interest secured the annexation of Texas, a Mexican district, largely settled by planters from the cotton-growing States. The war with Mexico which followed ended with a large in-

crease of Free territory, which the South sought to grasp for slavery. The passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the obsequious favor of the Supreme Court, failed to satisfy the South, or to perpetuate its supremacy in the national Congress. In the election of Abraham Lincoln, in 1860, it lost the Federal control it had held uninterruptedly for more than forty years, and immediately plunged into disunion.

The oft-repeated threat of South Carolina to secede from the Union was carried out, and her unfortunate example was followed by many of her sister States. Then came a four years' devastating civil war, in which two millions six hundred and seventy-five thousand troops were marshaled by the North alone, more than six hundred battles fought, half a million of lives sacrificed, and six thousand millions of treasure expended. The unsuccessful South suffered losses nearly as great, leaving it utterly bankrupt and prostrate. The North emerged from this prolonged encounter with little show of exhaustion. The tables of the Provost Marshal General showed that, in addition to the more than a million armed warriors in the field at the close of the strife, there remained at home in the loyal States, subject to military duty, 2,254,063 men, from whom large armies could still have been drawn. Their commercial and productive interests also remained unimpaired. During the few years that have elapsed since the close of the struggle, the Government, drawing most of its revenue from the North, has canceled vast floating and miscellaneous claims, contributed to internal improvements, paid regularly its pensions and governmental expenses, met its gold interest, and reduced its funded indebtedness to nearly two thousand millions. With peace and good government, the national debt will no longer be felt as a burden, two thirds of the war expenditures having been already paid.

This gigantic civil war in a nation of enlightened freemen in the middle of the nineteenth century presents one of the most melancholy chapters in all history. Besides the dissipation and brutality of the period, like all great wars, it has cultivated a love of treachery, vandalism, and blood, from which this generation will scarcely recover. Still, it has not been without its political advantages. The great inquiry, Are

we a nation? it has *affirmatively settled.* May we not believe that the illusion that the Union is a group of "sovereign" States, loosely united, as by a rope of sand, and which may be parted at any time by the caprice of one to the ruin of all, has given place to the conviction that the *Union is a compact nation*, consisting indeed of States with local and domestic authority, but with a Federal Government supreme over them all, and charged with every thing distinctively national, and that this Union is in its plan *indissoluble?* If this has been settled, the war has not been in vain. Another advantage of the war is the rooting up of the iniquitous system of American slavery, the foulest blot on our national fame, to the perpetuation of which a powerful class had become so wedded that no smaller convulsion could have destroyed it.

It has thus taken a century to find the subordinate position of the individual States, and to define and develop the powers of the Federal Government. May its maturity be more peaceful and illustrious than its youth! The Union began with 815,615 square miles of territory, but by the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Alaska, it has grown to 3,678,392 square miles, an increase since the adoption of the Constitution of more than threefold. Its population of three millions has increased to forty-five millions, (with space for five times that number,) and its accumulated wealth has advanced in still greater proportion. About half the railroad track of the world is in the United States. The nation has grown up quickly to stalwart proportions, and is contributing its quota to the triumph of man in the world. American manufactures compete at last with those of the old nations. Our steam-engines, sewing machines, and musical instruments are in demand every-where. The great newspapers of England are printed on American presses. The watch-makers of Geneva and the diamond cutters of Amsterdam are startled by the genius of American artisans. Gold and silver have lost their former values, because of the productions of American mines. America could thrive though separated from the nations, but her neighbors need her surplus. The operatives of Europe are hungering for her cereals, and her pork, beef, butter and fruits are being exported in considerable quantities. Even

her petroleum, that drips through her coal beds, is exported to all civilized countries, and is found in the lantern of the wild Arab of the desert. American colleges, libraries, and art collections are taking high rank, and the discoveries of her astronomers and naturalists are quoted by the *savants* of Europe.

But this paper would be entirely incomplete if it did not glance at a few of the disturbing elements still rife in American politics, and which threaten danger to the republic. Despite the criticisms and evil predictions of its foes, the nation has passed proudly through its first century and commenced the second. The patriot, after reviewing the past, finds himself instinctively peering into the uncertain haze of the future, as if prompted to exclaim, "Watchman, what of the night?" or what of the second century of American history?

It cannot be denied that the enormous use of intoxicating drinks in the United States is a source of great disaster and danger to the republic. The liquor interest is the bane and sorrow of the community every-where. It is a large and unscrupulous factor in the politics of every considerable town in the land, which all good men are perpetually forced to resist. The waste of the nation from this evil is not easily calculated. It has recently been ascertained that the State of Pennsylvania spends eight millions per annum on schools, and eighty millions on intoxicating drinks. New York City has 489 churches, or one to every 2,045 of the population, costing annually about five millions; but it has 8,000 drinking dens, or one to every 125 of the population, on which it expends sixty millions. The city government receives annually about $300,000 from the Excise Bureau, but it expends a million in charities and corrections, and six millions on its police and its courts, while the citizens, through private charities, disburse four millions more; and eight tenths of all this is legitimately chargeable to drink. About seventy thousand churches are found in the United States, but the temples of Bacchus number fully a quarter of a million. While there are less than eighty-five thousand clergymen teaching righteousness, there are at least half a million of men dealing out *liquid damnation*. The amount consumed annually in strong drink is more than double the entire provision bill of the nation, and, according to the sworn testimony of the liquor dealers, equals fifteen hundred

millions of dollars, with other entailed expenditures and losses which are very great. The spectacle of a hundred and forty-three thousand persons annually licensed by Government to deal out weakness and woe in an enlightened Christian nation, wasting in one year sufficient to cancel our entire national debt, besides the pauperism, ignorance, and crime it involves, is an enormity too appalling to be long perpetuated in this age of reform. Moral suasion, during the last half century, has wrought wonders, causing the greatness of this evil to be every-where recognized, and legal suasion cannot long be delayed. It is certain to be a troublesome element in our political caldron during the next quarter of a century. The Government of the United States cannot be perpetuated by untaught paupers, dram dealers, or criminals; and the wise dealings of the sober classes cannot too soon be turned to the proper handling of this grave subject.

The *encroachments of Romanism* comprise another factor that has long disturbed the sea of American politics, and is likely to produce even greater agitation in the future. No finer examples of Christian fraternity ever appeared on the globe than are now found among Protestant denominations in the United States. They are all vigorous, and devoted to the best interests of the nation and the race. But Romanism is essentially out of harmony with all our notions of civil liberty, free schools, free thought, and freedom of religious worship. Its mission here is not to enjoy and perpetuate our freedom, but to subvert it. For more than one hundred years North America has been regarded as the nursery of those liberal ideas that have extended through many countries, and shaken in pieces so hopelessly much of the despotism of Europe. To gain the moral control of the United States has, therefore, been one of the leading schemes of the Papacy. In 1828 the *St. Leopold Foundation* was organized in Vienna, in Austria, under royal patronage, and with a grant of papal indulgence, for the purpose of promoting "the greater activity of Catholic missions in the United States." Another powerful organization for the *Propagation of the Faith* was established many years ago at Lyons in France. As early as 1832 this society began to send money to the bishops of this country, and since that time it has furnished them millions. This society claimed

that by the discoveries and the early settlements of the French and the Spanish all America was essentially Roman Catholic territory, and, though occupied by the Puritans and their posterity, that the Catholic Church could never abandon the invaded territory. To complete this general scheme the English Romanists formed an *Emigration Society*, to establish colonies of Romanists, under the guidance of their priests, in various parts of the United States. The early conquest of this country by Catholicism has long been predicted by both foreign and American Romanists. O. A. Brownson, an American papist, said many years ago: "A new day is dawning on this chosen land; a new chapter is about to open in our history, and the Church to assume her rightful position and influence. Our hills and valleys shall yet echo to the convent bell. No matter who writes, who declaims, who intrigues, who is alarmed, or what leagues are formed, *this is to be a Catholic country*, and from Maine to Georgia, from the broad Atlantic to the broader Pacific, the sacrifice is to be offered daily for the quick and the dead." Other and later predictions might be given. These united agencies, coupled with the superior advantages of the American soil, have brought millions of Romish subjects to these shores, and millions of money to establish the institutions and fasten on us the despotism of the Papacy. Jesuits were long trained at Vienna expressly for American work, and with their recent banishment from some European countries they have come in large numbers to our land. They are closely watching all our ecclesiastical, educational, and legislative movements. Political organizations in support of this faith were rife in the days of Andrew Jackson, and date back to a much earlier period. There is not a gathering of importance in which the visage of one or more Jesuit is not seen. Through all their history they have had no platform, no schemes, no interest, but *Rome*. They are always in the market watching for the highest bidder, and they have invariably supported the vilest candidates. Thirty years ago the Archbishop of New York nominated openly one of his adherents for the Legislature, who on the day of his election was a criminal in the *Tombs*. Pope Pius IX. gave his benediction to the disunionists of 1861. The true American, let it be understood, has no pique against people of foreign birth. Indeed, many of our adopted citizens

take rank at once with the very best of the land. The Jews of America, coming as they do from all points of the compass, are devoted to their purposes of gain, and are entirely harmless. The French, the Italian, the Spanish, and the Japanese have made but slight impression on American manners. The Chinese are feared only on the Pacific coast. The Germans, as a whole, are a valuable class, industrious, frugal, and thrifty. Of the ten thousand paupers now begging through our streets, not one in a hundred is of Germanic origin. They have not been educated to our notions of the Sabbath, but they are patriotic, and cannot be called disorderly or riotous. Even the Papists among them are not bigoted. Like their fathers in the days of Melanchthon, they are ready to read, and are open to conviction. The Irish Catholic element is the most troublesome in the nation, and, if it were sufficiently numerous, would be dangerous. Its strongest foothold is in the State of New York, where it amounts to about one seventh of the population, and the city of New York contains over two hundred thousand persons born in Ireland. The politicians of New York city have for many years pursued a most execrable and suicidal policy. Many of them have been Romanists, and others, to secure the suffrage of these masses, have granted these Romish leaders every public advantage. Block after block of valuable real estate belonging to the city has been given to the Romish hierarchy, while millions of money, drawn from the tax-payers, have been paid for the support of their institutions, conferring upon the adherents of this system an unfair and an unwarrantable influence in municipal affairs. This treacherous policy still continues. The officials that have favored Rome have been invariably promoted. John T. Hoffman was city judge during the riot of 1863, and was promptly promoted to the mayoralty and to the gubernatorial chair. A. Oakey Hall was district attorney during the riot, and rose in due time to the mayoralty. John R. Brady and M'Cunn were then judges in the lower courts, but were each advanced to the Superior Court. There are sixty thousand persons in New York city unable to read or write, residents chiefly of the first, second, fourth, sixth, eleventh, seventeenth, and twentieth wards. These localities have been for years the political stronghold of Tammany Hall, furnishing the repeaters and "shoulder hitters" of the

city; and in November, 1876, with the aid of a few wards in Brooklyn, they swelled the majority for Mr. Tilden to about seventy thousand in these cities, thus neutralizing the voice of most of the intelligent business men and the yeomanry of the State. But the Irish Catholic vote *alone* can never be sufficiently large to be dangerous in America. The annual increase from immigration is vastly smaller than formerly, and if the entire population of Ireland should be imported into these States during the next five years, it would be absorbed without any great shock to our governmental machinery. They can only hope for some occasional local successes, but can gain no general ones while Americans are true to their high mission. The Catholic Directory for 1877 reports 5,292 churches, 5,297 priests, and estimates the Roman Catholic population of the country to be 6,200,000. Their tables of adherents are usually greatly overestimated; but if correct in this instance, they number less than one seventh of the population, and claim no more than adhere to some single denominations of Protestants. They are, however, vigilant and taciturn, compactly organized, advancing or retiring along the whole line at given signals—defiant or courteous, open or secret, on definite system—and deserve the closest watching by all lovers of true liberty. Though they will test the wisdom and strength of American statesmanship, and gain temporary local advantages, the march of free inquiry and of liberal ideas in the world, and the widespread turning away of their children of the third generation from their system, prove that it is DOOMED, and can never become supreme in the United States.

Another danger to American institutions lies in our national system of *universal suffrage*. The average American boasts that in this land every man may be an elector, and wield his full meed of power in the control of the country. Granting that superior advantages are thus afforded the enlightened and virtuous citizen, it cannot be denied that it is a perilous experiment to place the ballot in the hand of every male who attains his majority, and of every foreigner who applies for naturalization. In the earlier days of the Republic the franchise was in most of the States limited to sundry qualifications. In Maryland and South Carolina an elector must own fifty acres of land. In Mississippi, Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware,

and New York, he must pay taxes or perform military service. In some States men were disqualified by pauperism, in others by their faith, and in still others by their color. The march of party politics has at length swept away nearly all these restrictions. The naturalization of so many foreigners, chiefly in the interest of the Democrats, led their opponents in the Northern States to seek the removal of the property and color disqualifications from native-born citizens; and finally the ballot was given to the freedman to counterbalance that of the disloyal white in the South. The only serious popular movement of any magnitude to restrict the use of the ballot was that of the *Native American* party, (the "Know Nothings,") made about 1854; and, as I am not a politician, I am free to say that in a modified form its principles should have prevailed. A more perilous policy is scarcely conceivable than this wholesale enfranchisement of untried foreigners, many of whom have been the malcontents of other countries, and have fled from the armies, the banditti, or the prisons of those lands. Unworthy of our protection, we commit to them our most vital interests. Before they are able to read our laws or speak our language they are clothed with the high prerogatives of citizenship, and encouraged to cast the ballot which in this land contains all the potency of the scepter and the throne. The New York riot of 1863, and numerous other riots and political disturbances all over the country, the organizations of liquor dealers, and the war on our free schools, are some of the first bitter fruit of this mistaken policy. No one of these movements could have assumed such formidable aspects but for the enfranchisement of vicious foreigners, on whom these plotting leaders know they can rely.

The enfranchisement of the Southern Negro was another experiment of great hazard, though a more pardonable measure, as an ignorant loyal citizen may be of greater service to his nation than an educated rebel. Though unschooled and totally unused to the exercise of government, he is not specially vicious or dangerous. At the period of the emancipation of these Southern Negroes a magnificent opportunity was afforded the ruling party to move for the wise restriction of the ballot in the whole country. By withholding it from the untaught colored man a strong argument would have been made for its

withdrawal from all other ignorant citizens, in whatever section and of whatever blood. It was, however, urged that an exigency in the nation's history, such as had never demanded the enfranchisement of the foreign-born, made that of the Negro a necessity. The gift to him of power has brought its chapters of triumph and defeat. The sullen indifference of the defeated whites has left him, in some instances, to misrule and ruin where their presence and counsels could easily have averted disaster. What is to be the destiny of the American Negro is one of the unknown problems of our times. The people who are speaking, writing, and legislating for him are careful not to get very near him, and most of his professed friends are chiefly anxious to secure his influence. One thing appears certain, he *will not dwindle* like the American savage. The death rate among people of color all over the country, it has recently been ascertained, greatly exceeds that of their white neighbors. But when we remember that most of our colored people have just emerged into freedom, with little knowledge of hygiene, medicine, and the abuses of liberty, this unusual mortality is not surprising. The colored man belongs to a fruitful progeny, so that, despite the wastes of war and the starving transitions through which he has passed, his race is more numerous in these States than in 1860. *He will not emigrate.* Long residence on this continent has made him as thoroughly American as any in the land, and he is not disposed to change countries. Whether he will finally concentrate in certain sections of the Union, pressing out the other races, or the color line gradually fade away by amalgamation, or whether the cultivated ebony shall rise up, the proud, permanent peer of every other race, (as the Irishman has done whom the English reckoned inferior two hundred years ago,) are questions we cannot now determine. The ballot has, however, been placed in his hand, and from his numerical strength he is destined henceforth to be a powerful factor in American history. Already the politician wants him, the Papist is setting his net, and the Protestant, though too tardily and inadequately, is seeking his cultivation. It is unfortunate both for him and for the nation that in his crude state unrestricted enfranchisement has been thrust upon him. It exposes him to the relentless cruelty of his proud political enemies, from whom the

Federal Government cannot defend him, and leaves him an unsuspecting prey to artful and unscrupulous leaders and teachers who are hastening for his capture. It also imperils the nation. I urge deliberately these three points against universal suffrage: 1. In the present uncultivated state of general society it grants ignorance an unwarrantable control in the affairs of a country. The instincts and wishes of the unschooled may sometimes be right, (though they are often quite wrong,) still, a degree of culture is essential to enable them to discern wise methods of procedure, and to fit them for the exercise of the functions of government. Intelligent suffrage is indispensable to the security of a Republic, and no man should in this land be allowed to wield a ballot he cannot read. 2. It elevates to office moderate men, and too frequently the vilest men. A comparison of the two houses of our national Congress will well illustrate this point. The House of Representatives chosen by universal suffrage has been largely filled for a quarter of a century with third-rate village lawyers, while the Senate chamber, whose members are chosen by selected bodies, has been thronged with the most cultured and able men of the nation. Men in New York city have been repeatedly elected to Congress and to the Judiciary whom no executive would dare to appoint and whom no Legislature would choose. 3. My final objection is, that it places the wealth of the country at the mercy of the poor, who are always in the majority. Common equity demands that capital should have (at least in some guarded sense) the control of taxation. The security, therefore, both of national and of individual interests in this Republic demands some greater restrictions of the franchise, and movements in that direction will, doubtless, occur before we advance far into this century. When they do occur, let all good citizens unite for its judicious enactment. We have swung from the aristocracy of the Old World and of the slave-holder to the opposite extreme, and must soon or late feel our way back to middle ground.

## Art. VI.—METHODIST STATISTICS.*

In the earliest period of Methodism it was a part of the *method* of its founder to write down for the information of all inquirers every fact of importance connected with the rise and progress of his Societies. "Minutes of Conversations" between Mr. Wesley and his ministers in their yearly Conferences were carefully printed, showing not only the doctrines and polity of the new movement which he supervised, and which was justly exciting public attention, but also noting its successes or failures in every department of its economy. This rigid system of statement in detail has given to Methodism a statistical history far superior in variety, extent and correctness to that of any other religious denomination.

That portion of the British Wesleyan Conference Minutes commencing with the Annual Conference of 1744, and closing with that of 1860, fills fourteen large octavo volumes, with an aggregate of 8,299 pages. The Minutes of the Annual Sessions of Conference since 1860 fill seventeen volumes 12mo., with a total of 6,800 additional pages. The last volume, that of 1877, contains 444 pages, many of them in small type, of which a considerable portion is made up of carefully tabulated statistics. This grand total of thirty-one volumes includes the returns for one hundred and thirty-four years.

The General Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church thus far issued cover the period from 1773 to 1877 inclusive. These Minutes make sixteen volumes, aggregating 9,923 pages. The gradual and ever increasing extension of the records of the annual returns marks the constant growth of the Church in all departments of her work. Beginning with a Conference when the whole of American Methodism embraced only ten preachers, and five pastoral charges, with 1,160 lay members, the first Minutes were circumscribed in scope, and were correspondingly brief in extent. The whole records for the first fifty-six years, covering the period from 1773 to 1828, inclusive, are included in the first volume, of

* The "Methodist Almanac" for 1878, British Wesleyan Conference Minutes, Minutes of Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of branches of the Methodist family, for 1877.

574 pages. The second volume includes the Minutes of eleven years; the third, seven years; the fourth, six years; the fifth, four years. Beginning with the sixth volume, and with the year 1856, each volume is filled with the records of only two years, and recently, in order to include two yearly records within the proper compass of a single volume, the type has been largely reduced in size. The last volume (for 1876 and and 1877) contains 804 super-royal octavo pages, and of these 192 are filled with tabulated figures closely arranged, and in type so small that a single page contains three times as much matter as a page of the "Quarterly Review."

In addition to these volumes of "Minutes" are the Journals of the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church. These fill eight octavo volumes, and furnish, in their reports and other records, a vast amount of connectional statistical information not contained in the Minutes of the Annual Conferences. To all these must be added the printed reports of the Missionary Society, the Sunday-School Union, the Tract Society, the Board of Church Extension, and the Freedmen's Aid Society, embracing in the several departments a total of many volumes of statistical facts. Other branches of Methodism, inheriting the usage from the parent Church, are also characterized severally by an ample statistical history. As already indicated, no denomination outside of the Methodist family furnishes statistical information approaching this, either in the scope of the topics, or in the regularity, extent, and fullness of the current statistical returns.

In correctness, as well as in scope and fullness, our statistics are also far in advance of those of other denominations in this country. While being far from perfect, (so that there is a desire in all directions among us for improvement,) they are so incomparably more reliable than those of other leading Churches, as to have secured the highest praise from the best statisticians of the age. Mr. Francis A. Walker, Superintendent of the last United States Census, in his official report of the same to the Secretary of the Interior, (and by the latter communicated to Congress, and by that body ordered published,*) says:—

> Some of the larger religious denominations, either in consequence of their peculiar organization, or by reason of special

* See "Ninth Census of the United States," 1870.

efforts, maintain a careful system of reports and returns, and the statistics of such denominations are accordingly entitled to great consideration.

Foremost among these is the Methodist Church, which, by reason of its episcopal form of government and its scheme of changing periodically the pastors of Churches, is always in possession, as nearly as it would be possible to effect, of the true condition of its organization in all parts of the country to a late date. Dead Churches are not allowed to encumber its rolls, and consequently the lists of its several branches present their exact strength "for duty." This denomination, therefore, affords a high test of the accuracy of the returns of the Census; and, notwithstanding that it presents as much difficulty in enumeration as any other, the general correspondence between the statements embodied in the Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the principal branches of the Church, after making allowance for the known strength of certain minor branches which do not publish official returns, and the statistics of the denomination as given in the Census, is, taking all the States of the Union together, very decided. The slight differences that exist are sufficiently explained by differences between the dates of the returns and by the different rules of construction and classification which would naturally be adopted in doubtful cases by parties acting independently of each other.

There are other denominations, one or two, notably the Baptists, of great importance, in which an absence of central control in the government of the Churches and the want of a thorough system of reports and returns, deprive Church statistics of value. It is in respect of these, as a whole, that the discrepancies between the claims of the denomination and the results of the Census are greatest. In all such cases full and searching inquiry has been made; the recognized authorities of the Churches interested have been consulted, and assistant marshals have been called on to explain the discrepancy, and to review their own statements. Hundreds of letters have been written from the Census Office on the subject; thousands of Churches have been inquired for; and where differences, after all has been done, still exist, it only remains to be said that if this or that denomination has as many churches as it claims, the agents of the Census have not been able to find them.

Mr. Walker's official report, after furnishing this high testimony to the correctness of our Methodist statistics, proceeds to show remarkable discrepancies between the Census returns and those made by several of the other denominations. The Baptists, he says, report for the year 1870 a total of 17,535 churches, while the Census gives them only 14,084, a difference of 3,061. Another denomination claims 3,121 churches; the Census allows only 2,887; and another claims 3,753, while the Census allows only 1,445! In unanswerable argument

Mr. Walker proceeds to show that in each of the cases the disparity arises chiefly, if not wholly, from the incorrectness of the returns made by the Church compilers.

My own inquiries, made with as much thoroughness as possible, assure me of the general correctness of Mr. Walker's conclusions on the subject referred to. I have now before me two *Almanacs* of the Protestant Episcopal Church for 1878. Both seem to be the work of competent compilers, and each, in the absence of the other, being issued by a well-known and respectable publishing house of that denomination, would be regarded as officially correct. And yet in the reports of members, as given in the *Almanacs*, there is a discrepancy of over twenty thousand. Which is correct? The troubled inquirer is left to conjecture. The annual register of another denomination, issued since January 1, 1878, and giving the latest statistical summaries, contains two widely different "official statements" concerning members, the discrepancy being nearly 30,000. The statistician in search of correct figures is confounded by such a showing, and retires from the investigation in despair.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church every pastor is required to report each year to the conference secretaries, over his own signature, the statistics of his charge, revised to date; and in case of his decease or absence the Presiding Elder is held responsible for such reports. The reports are immediately collected in duplicate, one of the copies being forwarded by the Presiding Bishop to New York for insertion in the "General Minutes," and the other printed in the local conference minutes, for home circulation. This method of reporting and publishing each year, supplementing the system in each pastoral charge of keeping the register of members by classes, and of revising the lists yearly, (and in many charges, quarterly, and even monthly,) secures a very remarkable degree of accuracy in the annual returns of the Church. While there are occasional and even unpardonable mistakes in the reports of the pastors, and in some instances in those of the conference secretaries, (made chiefly in transcribing them,) they are much less frequent than some of our preachers have supposed. Indeed, the more careful and extensive the examination by any competent statistician, the more assuring will be the conclu-

sion that our statistics are comparatively a marvel of general accuracy and excellence.

The statistical summaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church for 1877, officially reported in the *Almanac* for 1878, and those in the "*General Minutes*," (though both series of tables were prepared by the same hand,) vary in some of the items, the difference arising from the fact that the former went to press before the holding of three or four of the South-western Conferences, while the latter was not issued until the complete official returns for the year had been received. In the subjoined tables the latest figures are given, and in each case compared with those closing the two previous decades:

ANNUAL CONFERENCES.—The number at close of 1877 was ninty-one; in 1867, sixty-eight; and in 1857, forty-seven. The gain during the former decade was twenty-one; during the latter twenty-three—a gain during two decades of forty-four Annual Conferences, or 93 6-10 per cent. In 1857 there were only two foreign Conferences, namely: Germany and Liberia; in 1877 the foreign Conferences were Germany, Liberia, Norway, Sweden, North India, and South India. Since the commencement of 1878, (and up to this writing, March 12,) two additional Conferences have been organized, namely: Little Rock, (colored,) by Bishop Harris, January 17; and Foochow, (Chinese,) by Bishop Wiley, January 20. The present number of Annual Conferences is, therefore, ninety-three.

BISHOPS.—The present number is eleven; in 1857 it was seven, and in 1867, ten. Thus far, covering the whole history of American Methodism, (111 years to Oct., 1877,) there have been in the Methodist Episcopal Church thirty-one Bishops, of whom twenty have passed from labor to reward. The first Bishops, Coke and Asbury, were elected in 1784, at which time the number of itinerant preachers was 83, and the lay-members, 14,986. The Episcopal ratio, omitting fractions, was one Bishop to 41 preachers, and to 7,493 lay-members. In 1787 the ratio was one Bishop to 66 preachers and to 12,921 members; in 1797, one Bishop to 131 preachers and to 29,331 members; in 1807, one Bishop to 258 preachers and to 72,295 members; in 1817, one Bishop to 238 preachers and to 74,951 members; in 1827, one Bishop to 325 preachers and to 127,332 members; in 1837, one Bishop to 449 preachers and to 94,081 members;

in 1847, one Bishop to 728 preachers and 127,294 members; in 1857, one Bishop to 876 preachers and 117,217 members; in 1867, one Bishop to 800 preachers and 114,608 members; and in 1877, one Bishop to 1,024 preachers and 151,964 members. In each case in these calculations the members on probation are properly counted with those in full connection.

ITINERANT PREACHERS.—The number of Itinerant Preachers returned in the Minutes of 1877 was 11,269, a gain during the year of 197. Of these 10,204 were in full connection, and 1,065 "on trial." The number of preachers received on trial in 1877 was 461; admitted into full connection, 401; located, 137; returned withdrawn, 40; expelled, 16; died, 118. The last four items give a total of 311, and show the loss to the itinerancy for the year.

The number received by transfer was 157; by re-admission, 20; and on credentials from other religious denominations, 18. Of those included in the last item there were received from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 3; Methodist Protestant Church, 3; African Methodist Episcopal Church, 3; African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, 2; Methodist Church of Canada, 2; Primitive Methodist Church in Canada, 1; United Methodist Free Church, 1; American Wesleyan, 1; Reformed Episcopal, 1; and Baptist, 1. The total number of accessions to the itinerancy during the year, on trial, by re-admission, and from other denominations, was 508. Deducting from this gain the loss, 311, we have 197, the net gain of preachers referred to above.

The following table, carefully compiled from the many volumes of Annual Minutes, shows the totals in the items named (so far as reported) from the organization of the Church until the close of 1877:—

| ITINERANT PREACHERS. | To and including 1857. | For Decade ending 1867. | For Decade ending 1877. | Grand Total. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Received on trial | 15,146 | 4,695 | 6,438 | 26,279 |
| Admitted into full connection | 10,606 | 3,256 | 4,962 | 18,824 |
| Located | 4,201 | 1,039 | 1,002 | 6,242 |
| Withdrawn | 222 | 257 | 244 | 723 |
| Expelled | 87 | 86 | 118 | 381 |
| Died | 1,277 | 736 | 1,079 | 3,092 |

A comparison of the first two items shows an apparent loss of 7,455 ministerial "probationers." In accounting for

this falling out, it should be noted: 1. That of this number 1,065 were still "on trial," their term of two years' probation not having expired, or having been extended. 2. That during the 104 years covered by these summaries a very large number fell out of the itinerant ranks by personal or family sickness or some other disability, or by death, during their two or more years of probationary service. 3. That in the earlier years of our Church history a very large number of persons entered the itinerancy as a *temporary arrangement*, in order to aid our meeting at once the imperative demand for preachers in the rapidly developing work. 4. That the severities of the itinerancy were then incomparably greater than now, in respect of fatiguing journeys, long absences from families, inadequate salaries, lack of privileges of education and of preparation for the full itinerant ministry. 5. That in retiring from the *itinerant* ranks, either before or at the close of their probation, the preachers did not retire from the Church, nor from her cherished ministry; they only re-entered another and honored, as well as useful, department of the Gospel service. 6. That of the number (6,242) who located *after their admission into "full connection,"* a large proportion did so within a comparatively brief period from the date of their admission. The same "causes" would be more powerfully operative before admission as full itinerants than afterward.

MINISTERIAL SERVICE.—The official ministerial appointments of the 11,269 preachers, returned in the Minutes of 1877, are indicated in the following table. As suggestive of the range of figures in the several departments of service, those for 1877 are collated with those of 1871 and 1867:—

| OFFICIAL APPOINTMENTS. | 1877. | 1871. | 1867. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Presiding Elders of Districts | 429 | 419 | 337 |
| Presiding Elders who are also Stationed Pastors | 26 | 7 | 21 |
| Presiding Elders with other Appointments | 3 | .. | .. |
| Agents of Book Concerns and Depositories | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Presidents and Principals of Educational Institutions | 94 | 88 | 95 |
| Professors of Colleges and Seminaries | 99 | 59 | 72 |
| Superintendents of other Institutions | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Chaplains by appointment of U. S. Government | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| Other Chaplains | 25 | 23 | 21 |
| Missionary and other Church Secretaries | 18 | 16 | 9 |
| Editors by episcopal appointment | 24 | 20 | 17 |

| Official Appointments. | 1877. | 1871. | 1867. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agents of Educational Institutions | 21 | 24 | 22 |
| Secretaries and Agents of Bible Societies | 18 | 27 | 24 |
| Secretaries and Agents of Temperance Societies | 11 | 8 | 8 |
| Other Agents | 27 | 20 | 11 |
| Conference and City Missionaries and Evangelists | 8 | .. | 3 |
| Itinerants appointed to Foreign Missions | 71 | .. | 17 |
| Supernumeraries | 719 | 548 | 461 |
| Superannuated | 1,193 | 971 | 854 |
| Itinerant Stationed Pastors | 9,440 | 7,452 | 6,036 |

In addition to the itinerant stationed pastors named in the last item above, there were 1,335 preachers (chiefly local preachers) appointed by Presiding Elders and Bishops to pastoral charges left at the Conference sessions "to be supplied."

Local Preachers.—The annual returns in the General Minutes do not give the number of Local Preachers until after the General Conference of 1836. The returns for 1837 show a total of 4,954. In 1844, the year of the separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the number had increased to 8,087. It is estimated that nearly 4,000 local preachers went with that Church. In 1847 the number reported in our Church was 4,913; in 1857 there were 7,169, a net increase for the decade of 2,256; in 1867 there were 9,469, an increase of 2,300; and in 1877 there were 12,537, an increase of 3,068; making a total net increase for the last thirty years of 7,624, or over *one hundred and fifty-five per cent.*

Since 1773 local preachers have contributed to the lists of itinerant ministers "received on trial" about 26,279 names. The number returned to the local ranks from the "full connection" department of the itinerancy is 6,217; the number returned from the list of itinerant probationers and the number "re-admitted" into full connection, the number who have died, and the losses from other causes, have not been recorded. In 1877, 1,335 pastoral charges were left "to be supplied;" and a large proportion of them were supplied by local preachers appointed by the Presiding Elders. A similar record would be true of other years.

Lay Members.—The total number of lay members reported in 1877 was 1,671,608, of whom 1,471,777 were members in full connection, and 199,831 were members on probation. The losses by death during the year aggregated 19,816. The

losses from other causes (by certificates of membership *in transitu*, withdrawals, suspensions, expulsions, etc.) are not recorded in the General Minutes. The total net gain of full members during the year was 46,783; decrease of members on probation, (chiefly by reception into full connection,) 26,687; net increase in lay membership for the year, 20,096.

Eleven decades and one year have passed since the organization of the first Methodist Society in this country. Counting in the first year, when the membership was very small, with the first subsequent decade, and taking the lay membership at intervals of ten years, we have the following table:—

| Years. | Lay Members. | Gain during Decade. | Years. | Lay Members. | Gain during Decade. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1777..... | 6,968 | ..... | 1837..... | 658,574 | 276,577 |
| 1787..... | 25,842 | 18,874 | 1847..... | 636,471 | *dec.* 22,103 |
| 1797..... | 58,863 | 33,021 | 1857..... | 820,519 | 184,048 |
| 1807..... | 144,590 | 85,727 | 1867..... | 1,146,081 | 325,562 |
| 1817..... | 224,853 | 80,263 | 1877 ..... | 1,671,608 | 525,527 |
| 1827..... | 381,997 | 157,144 | | | |

These figures speak eloquently and conclusively in answer to the question whether Methodism is losing its power as an aggressive force among the masses of the people. Here is a *net gain in members* (embracing good and true Christian men and women from all departments of society) *of over half a million during the last decade of our history!*

Losses by Death.—The utterance of Wesley, "*Our people die well*," has passed into a familiar proverb in Methodist homes in every part of the world. The *method* of preserving memoirs of deceased preachers was early adopted in England and America, and has given invaluable contributions to our Church history as well as our Church life. It is peculiar to Methodism.

Our General Minutes for 1877 include memoirs of 97 of the 118 preachers whose deaths are reported in that year. The British Wesleyan Minutes furnish memoirs of 42 of the 43 ministers deceased during the year, and state in a note that the remaining memoir, not having been received in time for present insertion, will be printed in the volume for 1878. In respect of length, the memoirs in our Minutes for 1877 average about 555 words each, and those in the British Conference Minutes average about 521 words each.

No deaths of preachers were reported in our General Minutes

until 1784, a period of eleven years. For the next forty years the number per year ranged from one to ten, the yearly average being only four; from 1824 to 1857, a period of thirty-two years, the average was 33, with a total of 1,053. Beginning with the year 1857, when the deaths of lay members were first officially reported, we have the following record:—

| Year. | Deaths of Preachers. | Deaths of Members. | Year. | Deaths of Preachers. | Deaths of Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1857 | 46 | 8,462 | 1868 | 84 | 12,772 |
| 1858 | 52 | 9,214 | 1869 | 82 | 13,554 |
| 1859 | 53 | 9,845 | 1870 | 92 | 14,244 |
| 1860 | 66 | 9,835 | 1871 | 84 | 15,682 |
| 1861 | 64 | 10,375 | 1872 | 101 | 17,048 |
| 1862 | 73 | 10,662 | 1873 | 136 | 18,900 |
| 1863 | 91 | 13,269 | 1874 | 104 | 18,105 |
| 1864 | 88 | 13,448 | 1875 | 135 | 19,591 |
| 1865 | 86 | 13,116 | 1876 | 143 | 19,010 |
| 1866 | 80 | 12,214 | 1877 | 118 | 19,816 |
| 1867 | 83 | 12,575 | Total for 21 years. | 1,861 | 291,737 |

As stated on a previous page of this article, the total number of deaths of preachers up to the close of 1877 was 3,092. In order to approximate the number of deaths in the lay membership previous to 1857, a calculation may be made for each previous period of twenty-one years back to 1793, *based* upon the ratio of the yearly average of *members* to the yearly average of *deaths*, during the last period of twenty-one years. For the remaining double decade from 1773 (the first Conference) a small allowance must also be added. Combining the several numerical items thus obtained with the total of the official summaries in the table above, we have a grand total of 605,504.

The ratio of increase in the ministerial death list for the last period of twenty-one years is $156\frac{53}{100}$, and in that of lay members $134\frac{11}{100}$. At this rate the death list for the year 1898 will be 302 preachers and 46,403 lay members, and in the year 1900 a death list of 320 preachers, and about 49,000 lay members. These figures will indicate to the reader the large influx of new ministers and members required to meet the numerical waste from the single item of "deaths." Last year the average weekly mortality in the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was *three hundred and eighty-three*, and a daily average of about *fifty-five!*

Our Colored Work.—The Methodist Episcopal Church has from the beginning welcomed colored persons into its

membership. The first class in the old John-street Society had one colored member, and the historic fact is well attested that there has never been a time since when the membership of that Church did not include one or more colored persons. Other "white" Churches in the North have colored members, and some of the "colored" charges in the South have white members. In the spring of 1864 Philadelphia Conference reported, in a total membership of 59,498, colored members to the number of 6,894. Most of these were organized with others during the same year into the Delaware Conference.

In the South, and in the "Border States," the white and colored work has been, to a large extent, arranged into separate Conferences. Those Annual Conferences which are either wholly or chiefly "colored" are the following: Liberia, Delaware, Washington, North Carolina, South Carolina, Savannah, Florida, Central Alabama, Lexington, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, West Texas, and Little Rock.

By carefully collating the statistics of those Conferences exclusively colored, with the statistics of the colored Churches in the various mixed Conferences, we have the following summaries for 1877:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Itinerant Preachers..... | 928 | Total Baptisms for the year.. | 18,872 |
| Local Preachers..... | 1,976 | Church Edifices..... | 1,442 |
| Total Preachers..... | 2,904 | Value of Church Edifices... | $1,562,501 |
| Lay Members in Full Connection..... | 127,326 | Parsonages ..... | 143 |
| Lay Members on Probation.. | 21,325 | Value of Parsonages..... | $77,675 |
| Total Lay Members..... | 148,651 | Total Val. Ch's and Parson's. | $1,640,176 |
| Deaths of Members for year | 2,674 | Sunday-schools ..... | 1,731 |
| Baptisms of Children..... | 11,142 | S. S. Officers and Teachers.. | 8,513 |
| Baptisms of Adults..... | 7,730 | Sunday-school Scholars..... | 80,950 |
| | | Total Teachers and Scholars. | 89,463 |

German Methodism.—The German work in the Methodist Episcopal Church began in Cincinnati in 1835, when Dr. William Nast collected together a half dozen Germans in a small hired house in that city. The class there formed was the "little one which became a thousand." At the session of the Ohio Conference, held at Springfield, Ohio, August 19, 1835, William Nast was received on trial, and appointed German missionary for Cincinnati. In 1838 he was appointed German editor of the "Christian Apologist." The first German Conference was organized in the autumn, and reported in the Minutes of that year 22 members. The first German

Methodist Episcopal Church was built in Wheeling, West Va., in 1840. In 1844 the work was separated into German Districts, and in 1864 the first German Conference was formed. The mission work in Germany opened in Bremen under the late Dr. L. S. Jacoby, December 23, 1849. The English Wesleyan Methodists had previously entered upon mission work in Southern Germany. Our German work in Europe was organized into a Mission Conference in 1856, with a membership of 9 itinerant preachers, 7 local preachers, and 527 lay members.

The present strength of the Methodist Episcopal German work is indicated by the following summaries for 1877:—

| German Methodism. | 1867. | 1877. | Increase in Ten Years. | Gain per cent. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual Conferences | 5 | 7 | 2 | 40. |
| Traveling Preachers | 341 | 542 | 201 | 58.9 |
| Local Preachers | 327 | 465 | 138 | 42.2 |
| Total Preachers | 668 | 1,007 | 339 | 50.7 |
| Lay Members | 32,259 | 52,216 | 19,957 | 61.8 |
| Adult Baptisms | 44 | 62 | ..... | .... |
| Infant Baptisms | 3,441 | 4,240 | ..... | .... |
| Church Edifices | 441 | 667 | 226 | 51.2 |
| Value of Church Edifices | $1,214,466 | $3,679,860 | $2,465,394 | 203. |
| Parsonages | 175 | 316 | 141 | 80.5 |
| Value of Parsonages | $175,985 | $343,450 | $163,465 | 90.8 |
| Sunday-schools | 621 | 1,042 | 421 | 67.7 |
| Officers and Teachers | 5,148 | 8,771 | 3,623 | 70.3 |
| Sunday-school Scholars | 28,279 | 52,753 | 24,474 | 87.2 |

Our English Wesleyan brethren have one district in Germany, embracing (in March, 1877) 21 German pastoral charges, with a total of 22 traveling preachers and 2,356 lay members.

Our Work in the South.—The following gives the totals, in the items named, for the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1877:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Annual Conferences | 22 | Church Edifices | 2,424 |
| Itinerant Preachers | 1,323 | Value of Church Edifices | $1,486,606 |
| Local Preachers | 2,814 | Parsonages | 232 |
| Total Preachers | 4,136 | Value of Parsonages | $157,440 |
| Total Lay Members | 226,167 | Tot. Val. Ch's and Parsonages | $1,644,046 |
| Deaths of Memb's during year | 2,906 | Sunday-schools | 2,664 |
| Baptisms of Children | 10,816 | S. S. Officers and Teachers | 14,624 |
| Baptisms of Adults | 12,131 | Sunday-school Scholars | 124,925 |
| Total Baptisms for the year | 22,947 | Total Teachers and Scholars | 139,549 |

In the compilation of the above table the summaries of the following Conferences are embraced: North Carolina,

South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Savannah, Alabama, Central Alabama, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Lexington, Holston, Tennessee, Central Tennessee, Mississippi, Little Rock, Arkansas, Louisiana, Southern German, Austin, Texas, and West Texas. One of these (Little Rock) was organized since the commencement of 1878. Delaware, Washington, Baltimore, South Kansas, St. Louis, Missouri, Southern California, and South-west German are counted with the North. Those who desire to class any of the latter with the South will only need to select the proper figures in the General Minutes, and combine them with those above.

GROWTH OF WHOLE LAY MEMBERSHIP COMPARED WITH THAT OF POPULATION.—Here, also, the figures show largely to the advantage of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Instituting a comparison by taking the decades corresponding with those of the U. S. Census reports, we have this interesting table:—

| YEARS. | Population. | Increase. | Gain per ct. in Population. | Gain per ct. in M. E. Ch. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1790..... | 3,929,827 | ..... | .... | .... |
| 1800..... | 5,305,937 | 1,376,110 | 35.02 | 12.60 |
| 1810..... | 7,239,814 | 1,933,887 | 36.45 | 168.96 |
| 1820..... | 9,638,191 | 2,398,377 | 33.12 | 48.87 |
| 1830..... | 12,866,020 | 3,227,829 | 33.49 | 83.21 |
| 1840..... | 17,069,453 | 4,203,433 | 32.67 | 68.38 |
| 1850..... | 23,191,876 | 6,122,423 | 35.87 | .... |
| 1860..... | 31,443.321 | 8,297,685 | 35.78 | 44.20 |
| 1870..... | 38,558,371 | 7,115,050 | 22.62 | 37.47 |

The figures showing the progress of the Church for the decade ending with 1850 are omitted, because, as previously noted, during that decade nearly half a million of members fell out of our count by the separation and organization of the Southern Church. It will be seen that the Methodist Episcopal Church has led the population in every decade from the beginning except one. Taking all the decades except the one in which the Southern separation was effected, the average increase in population for each decade was 32.73, while that of our Church Lay-membership has been 66.24, or *more than double that of the population!*

STRENGTH OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH BY STATES.—The space assigned to this paper will not permit a discussion of this question. As an indication, however, of a class of facts which would appear by carefully tabulated statistics in

many of the States, the reader is referred to the annexed table, compiled from the "Census of the State of New York for 1875," recently issued by the State authorities in Albany:—

| Denominations in State. | Organizations | Edifices. | Sittings. | Membership. | Property. | | Annual Amount Paid for Salaries of Clergy. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Ch'ch Edifices, with Lots. | Other Real Estate. | |
| Methodist Episcopal | 1,785 | 1,766 | 619,382 | 180,782 | $14,566,897 | $2,423,475 | $1,137,885 |
| African M. E. | 48 | 47 | 14,065 | 3,261 | 274,800 | 16,400 | 19,095 |
| African M. E. Zion | 5 | 5 | 2,075 | 111 | 20,700 | 500 | 2,100 |
| Calvinistic Methodist | 17 | 17 | 4,975 | 1,090 | 74,500 | 8,050 | 5,294 |
| Evangelical Association | 60 | 60 | 17,595 | 5,786 | 437,200 | 49,650 | 33,925 |
| Independent Methodist | 1 | 1 | 175 | 5 | 1,000 | 50 | 150 |
| Methodist Protestant | 15 | 15 | 3,581 | 884 | 28,300 | 3,245 | 5,005 |
| Primitive Methodist | 2 | 2 | 900 | 205 | 48,500 | 8,000 | 1,500 |
| Reformed Methodist | 5 | 5 | 1,250 | 217 | 7,300 | 1,700 | 1,300 |
| United Brethren in Christ | 4 | 4 | 870 | 130 | 4,400 | 1,500 | 750 |
| Free Methodist | 89 | 87 | 22,685 | 3,716 | 234,260 | 27,700 | 30,578 |
| Wesleyan Methodist | 52 | 52 | 13,175 | 2,713 | 148,300 | 15,850 | 17,464 |
| Total Methodist | 2,083 | 2,059 | 700,678 | 198,900 | $15,845,657 | $2,561,120 | $1,255,016 |
| Baptist | 823 | 812 | 313,673 | 100,886 | $8,371,800 | $648,375 | $630,891 |
| Freewill Baptist | 109 | 102 | 29,350 | 6,051 | 284,600 | 43,225 | 38,190 |
| Seventh-Day Baptist | 26 | 26 | 8,305 | 3,335 | 76,150 | 5,475 | 10,173 |
| Total Baptist | 958 | 940 | 351,308 | 109,972 | $8,732,550 | $697,075 | $678,759 |
| Presbyterian | 716 | 708 | 338,442 | 111,660 | $16,590,300 | $2,528,870 | $950,770 |
| United Presbyterian | 55 | 55 | 24,970 | 9,015 | 564,100 | 56,625 | 61,710 |
| Reformed Presbyterian | 23 | 23 | 9,250 | 3,023 | 356,700 | 9,075 | 28,650 |
| Total Presbyterian | 794 | 786 | 372,662 | 123,698 | $17,511,100 | $2,619,570 | $1,041,130 |
| Friends, Hicksite | 22 | 22 | 10,650 | 1,583 | 346,100 | 14,850 | ..... |
| Orthodox | 24 | 24 | 6,750 | 937 | 68,650 | 700 | ..... |
| Not specified | 45 | 44 | 11,705 | 2,394 | 221,200 | 14,900 | ..... |
| Total Friends | 91 | 90 | 29,105 | 4,964 | $635,950 | $30,450 | ..... |
| Protestant Episcopal | 561 | 552 | 226,092 | 78,515 | 21,616,750 | 2,984,620 | $10,872 |
| Congregational | 258 | 257 | 107,847 | 30,922 | 3,210,300 | 402,700 | 265,045 |
| Reformed (Dut.) Ch. in U.S. | 237 | 235 | 109,815 | 35,397 | 5,770,298 | 2,168,325 | 201,240 |
| Evangelical Lutheran | 201 | 200 | 77,731 | 34,439 | 2,010,000 | 473,360 | 136,678 |
| Union | 147 | 147 | 43,515 | 7,747 | 682,100 | 20,950 | 37,796 |
| Universalist | 115 | 113 | 41,978 | 9,651 | 1,413,400 | 88,300 | 96,280 |
| Christian Connection | 102 | 100 | 28,555 | 6,270 | 247,920 | 25,500 | 34,291 |
| Campbellites | 26 | 26 | 8,340 | 2,330 | 111,700 | 700 | 15,265 |
| Second Adventists | 14 | 13 | 2,992 | 609 | 28,150 | 8,425 | 3,250 |
| United Evangelical Ch'ch | 13 | 13 | 5,950 | 2,699 | 68,500 | 6,500 | 8,425 |
| Reformed Church in U.S. | 11 | 11 | 4,610 | 1,821 | 85,000 | 18,900 | 9,300 |
| Unitarian | 10 | 16 | 8,560 | 2,477 | 817,000 | ..... | 46,000 |
| Moravian | 10 | 10 | 2,515 | 663 | 163,400 | 20,250 | 5,200 |
| True Reformed Dutch Ch. | 7 | 7 | 2,120 | 244 | 73,500 | 2,000 | 3,000 |
| New Jerusalem Church | 7 | 6 | 1,575 | 206 | 158,800 | 5,000 | 8,100 |
| Shakers | 3 | 3 | 2,000 | 326 | 35,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Independent | 2 | 2 | 880 | ..... | 40,000 | ..... | 2,000 |
| Seventh-Day Adventists | 2 | 2 | 350 | 84 | 5,600 | 650 | ..... |
| Mennonites | 2 | 2 | 300 | 61 | 700 | ..... | ..... |
| Advent Chris. Association | 1 | 1 | 800 | 53 | 4,500 | ..... | 600 |
| Roman Catholic | 613 | 609 | 387,226 | * 518,714 | 18,301,500 | 4,366,400 | 467,814 |
| Jewish | 46 | 43 | 25,416 | 5,775 | 8,586,900 | 68,500 | 70,000 |
| Grand total in New York | 6,920 | 6,243 | 2,337,470 | 1,177,470 | $101,105,765 | $16,491,385 | $5,800,231 |

A glance at the preceding table will show that in the State of New York the Methodist Episcopal Church leads all the other denominations in all the items given in the Census except that of Church property.

* The Roman Catholic Church counts in its membership the whole *population*.

PROGRESS IN CHURCH PROPERTY AND SUNDAY-SCHOOL WORK.—The General Minutes do not furnish a yearly record of the number of Churches and parsonages, with their estimated value, and of the number of Sunday-schools, with their officers and teachers, until 1857. By collating the returns from and including that date, we have a table furnishing at once a most lucid, instructive, and gratifying exhibit of the progress of the Methodist Episcopal Church in these departments of Christian effort during the last two decades:—

| Year. | Churches. | Value. | Parsonages. | Value. | Sunday-schools. | Officers and Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1857..... | 8,835 | $15,781,310 | 2,174 | $2,126,874 | 10,766 | 114,791 | 591,468 |
| 1858..... | 9,063 | 17,560,494 | 2,407 | 2,350,992 | 11,490 | 129,368 | 677,217 |
| 1859..... | 9,205 | 18,822,640 | 2,540 | 2,427,168 | 11,735 | 139,299 | 732,592 |
| 1860..... | 9,754 | 19,552,054 | 2,674 | 2,663,318 | 12,243 | 146,130 | 793,131 |
| 1861..... | 9,922 | 20,069,580 | 2,763 | 2,669,907 | 12,356 | 146,910 | 840,266 |
| 1862..... | 9,860 | 20,005,981 | 2,792 | 2,681,790 | 12,182 | 146,379 | 805,050 |
| 1863..... | 9,939 | 20,880,554 | 2,853 | 2,790,150 | 13,068 | 146,967 | 884,176 |
| 1864..... | 10,015 | 23,781,510 | 2,918 | 3,101,566 | 13,173 | 148,475 | 859,709 |
| 1865..... | 10,041 | 26,750,502 | 3,143 | 4,396,731 | 13,948 | 153,699 | 931,524 |
| 1866..... | 10,462 | 29,594,004 | 3,314 | 4,420,958 | 14,045 | 162,191 | 980,622 |
| 1867..... | 11,121 | 35,885,439 | 3,570 | 5,361,295 | 15,341 | 174,945 | 1,081,891 |
| 1868..... | 11,692 | 41,603,922 | 3,810 | 6,276,579 | 15,885 | 181,666 | 1,145,167 |
| 1869..... | 12,048 | 47,259,067 | 3,968 | 6,562,230 | 16,393 | 184,596 | 1,179,984 |
| 1870..... | 13,373 | 52,614,591 | 4,179 | 7,293,513 | 16,912 | 189,412 | 1,221,836 |
| 1871..... | 13,440 | 56,911,900 | 4,300 | 7,786,804 | 17,555 | 193,979 | 1,267,542 |
| 1872..... | 14,008 | 62,393,237 | 4,484 | 8,575,377 | 17,471 | 195,691 | 1,278,559 |
| 1873..... | 14,490 | 66,342,680 | 4,677 | 8,442,554 | 18,031 | 197,180 | 1,318,601 |
| 1874..... | 15,010 | 69,228,815 | 4,893 | 9,604,230 | 18,628 | 200,402 | 1,363,476 |
| 1875..... | 15,633 | 71,453,274 | 5,017 | 9,731,628 | 19,287 | 207,182 | 1,406,168 |
| 1876..... | 15,816 | *71,760,771 | 5,215 | *9,503,900 | 19,691 | 208,966 | 1,453,033 |
| 1877..... | 16,290 | 70,289,441 | 5,355 | 9,175,480 | 19,868 | 216,902 | 1,493,718 |
| Increase former dec. | 2,786 | 20,104,129 | 1,396 | 3,234,421 | 4,875 | 60,154 | 490,423 |
| " latter " | 5,079 | 34,354,002 | 1,785 | 3,814,185 | 4,624 | 41,957 | 411,827 |
| Total gain..... | 7,865 | 54,458,131 | 3,181 | 7,048,606 | 9,099 | 102,111 | 902,250 |

The above figures show a *net* gain during the last twenty years as follows: In number of church edifices, $94\frac{36}{100}$ *per cent.;* value of church edifices, $345\frac{7}{10}$ *per cent.;* parsonages, $146\frac{32}{100}$ *per cent.;* value of parsonages, $331\frac{40}{100}$ *per cent.;* Sunday-schools, $84\frac{50}{100}$ *per cent.;* Sunday-school officers and teachers, $89\frac{19}{100}$ *per cent.;* and in scholars, $153\frac{5}{100}$ *per cent.*

COMPARISON WITH OTHER CHURCHES.—The last United States Census, 1870, shows that in that year the relative strength of the six leading denominations was as follows:—

| DENOMINATIONS. | Organizations, 1870. | Edifices, 1870. | Sittings, 1870. | Property, 1870. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Methodists.... | 27,538 | 22,915 | 7,455,937 | $73,975,581 |
| Baptists (all kinds).. | 15,829 | 13,962 | 4,360,135 | 41,608,198 |
| Total Presbyterians.. | 7,824 | 7,071 | 2,698,244 | 52,265,256 |
| Congregational ..... | 2,887 | 2,715 | 1,117,212 | 25,069,698 |
| Protestant Episcopal. | 2,835 | 2,601 | 991,051 | 36,514,549 |
| Roman Catholic..... | 4,127 | 3,806 | 1,900,514 | 60,985,566 |

The Roman Catholics now claim in the United States about 5,000 bishops and priests, 7,000 churches, chapels, and stations,

* Decrease caused by lowering old estimates so as to conform to changed market.

and a total *population* of about 6,000,000; and this entire population is incorrectly counted in the membership!

The other large denominations, in their later numerical summaries, furnish the following figures:—

| | Ministers. | Members. | | Ministers. | Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baptists..... | 14,596 | 2,024,224 | Congregationalists. | 3,333 | 350,658 |
| Presbyterians.. | 6,631 | 670,224 | Protestant Epis. .. | 2,900 | 281,977 |

The figures which go to make up the Baptist total in this table are in many cases largely "estimated;" (see "Baptist Year Book for 1878;") but assuming them to be correct, we are confronted with the fact that in obtaining them the returns are taken of all "Baptist" congregations, *without respect of ecclesiastical or denominational affiliations.* Over half of the ministers and over two thirds of the Churches and members are in the South, and there is no connectional bond between them and those in the North. They are as widely separated in any denominational fellowship as are the Northern and Southern Presbyterians, or the different branches of the Methodist family.

In any fair comparison, therefore, with the "Baptists," *similar totals must be taken from the other denominations.* In the first of the following tables the Presbyterian total embraces those reported by the General Assemblies, North and South, and the "Methodist" totals those reported by the branches which are *episcopal* in their connectional administration. In the second, the latest official returns of *all* Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Protestant Episcopal denominations in the United States are properly grouped together.

| *First Table.* | Ministers. | Members. | *Second Table.* | Ministers. | Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Methodists ..... | 20,708 | 3,120,068 | Total Methodists. | 22,718 | 3,293,469 |
| Baptists, N. and S. | 14,596 | 2,024,224 | " Baptists .. | 16,384 | 2,147,421 |
| Presbyte's, N. & S. | 6,631 | 670,224 | " Presbyte'n | 7,908 | 857,858 |
| Congregat'nalists | 3,333 | 350,658 | " Congrega's | 3,333 | 350,658 |
| Protestant Epis.. | 3,216 | 281,977 | " Prot. Epis. | 3,216 | 281,977 |

[The grouping in this table includes the Baptists, ("Regular,") Anti-Mission Baptists, Free-Will Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, and Six-Principle Baptists; also the Presbyterian, Southern Presbyterian, Cumberland Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, and United Presbyterian Churches. For a complete list of Methodist Churches, whose statistics are included, see Methodist Almanac for 1878, page 40. In the total of Methodist ministers the local preachers (26,443) are not included, although many of them are ordained, and have been engaged in pastoral work.]

The remarkable relative success of Methodism thus far in this and in other countries imposes upon her ministers and members corresponding obligations of continued loyalty to her "doctrines," "polity," and "usages." *His signis vincemus.*

## Art. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

American Catholic Quarterly Review, January, 1878. (Philadelphia.)—1. How Exclusive Ownership in Property First Originated: Communism. 2. Actual Situation of the Church in Countries Outside of European Sway. 3. The Metaphysics of Insanity: A Psychological Research. 4. The Aryan Language and Literature. 5. The Survival of Ireland. 6. The Bible in American History. 7. The Mercersburg Movement: An Attempt to Find Ground on which Protestantism and Catholicity might Unite.

Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1878. (Andover.)—1. Women Keeping Silence in Churches. 2. The Bearing of Recent Scientific Thought upon Theology. 3. Horae Samaritanae. 4. A Century of War and its Lesson. 5. Theories of Atonement. 6. The Star of the East.

Lutheran Quarterly, January, 1878. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Allentown Church Case. 2. Relation of American Colleges to Christianity. 3. The Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church. 4. Prayer-Cures. 5. Use and Abuse of Denominationalism. 6. Interpretation of Philippians ii, 6, 7.

New-England Historical and Genealogical Register, January, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Biographical Sketch of William B. Towne, A.M., Founder of the "Towne Memorial Fund." 2. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Dartmouth. 3. Penhallow Papers. 4. Genealogy of the Penhallow Family. 5. Autobiography of William Rotch. 6. Prison Ships and Old Mill Prison, Plymouth, England. 7. Record of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, Inspection, and Safety. 8. Deaths in Stratham, N. H. 9. Will of Nowell Hilton, 1687. 10. Deed to Thomas Cammock from Gorges and Mason, 1634. 11. John Grenaway. 12. Letter of Paul Richard to Jacob Wendell. 13. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown, Mass. 14. Longmeadow, Mass., Families. 15. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison, 1777–79. Diary of Timothy Connor. 16. Papers relating to the Solart Estate, Wenham. 17. Voyages of Goshold and Pring to New England, 1602–3. 18. Taxes under Governor Andros. 19. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Lyme, Conn.

Southern Review, January, 1878. (Baltimore.)—1. Edwards on the Will. 2. Mrs. Browning. 3. The Papacy and the Civil Power of the Empire. 4. The Gospel according to St. John. 5. The Homeric Poems.

Theological Medium, A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, January, 1878. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Theories of the Pentateuch. 2. The Bible, and its Influence upon Modern Literature and Art. 3. A Critic Reviewed. 4. Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.—No. XII.

New Englander, January, 1878. (New Haven.)—1. New-Fangled Congregationalism. 2. Aphorisms concerning the Inspiration of the Scriptures. 3. The Philosophy of the Unconscious in Court. 4. Review of President Seelye's Inaugural Address on the Relations of Learning and Religion, at Amherst College. 5. Professor Tyndall's Last Deliverance. 6. Review of Dr. Dale's Lectures on Preaching, recently delivered at Yale College. 7. Review of Rev. Newman Smyth's Work on the "Religious Feeling." 8. The Political Outlook. 9. Review of Principal Shairp's Work "On Poetical Interpretation of Nature." 10. Review of Rev. Joseph Cook's Lectures on Biology.

New Englander, March, 1878.—1. New England Secessionists. 2. Talk on Art. 3. The Doctrine of Future Punishment. 4. A Review of "Transcendentalism." 5. Victor Emanuel: the First King of Italy. 6. Schliemann's Explorations.

With the present volume this review changes from a Quarterly to a Bimonthly, in the hope of an earlier discussion of

topics of public interest. The freshly revived debate on the duration of future punishment furnishes the occasion of a triple article, consisting of three essays by prominent Congregational ministers. The first, by Professor Fisher, is an excellent "Sketch of the History of the Doctrine," showing that through the first six centuries of the Church, its patristic period, the prevalent opinion was that future punishment is endless, though Origen, Clement, and a few others thought otherwise. Then came the doctrine of Purgatory, with its notion of reforming and purifying of souls after death, founded on a suggestion of Augustine; and this was the common belief when the Reformers arose. The opinions of later German and English theologians receive appropriate mention, but the course of thought in this country is not traced. Professor Fisher makes the following important statement: "As a historical fact, belief in restoration and kindred doctrines is seen to spring up, in different quarters, in the wake of the mitigated form of theology to which we have referred," namely, "modified Calvinism."

The second and third essays, written independently of each other, and on the same subject, "The Teaching of Christ respecting the Duration of Future Punishment," are furnished by Rev. J. M. Whiton and Professor W. S. Tyler. They may be taken as representing the two phases of thought which seem to exist among our Congregational brethren. The former examines three questions, namely: "1. Did Christ teach that future punishment ends in purification and restoration? 2. Did he teach that it ends in extinction of being? 3. Did he teach that it is endless?" The conclusion reached by Mr. Whiton we give in his own words: "It does not appear that the teachings of Christ pronounce upon the duration of future punishment. They affirm no hope of restoration, they foretell no ultimate extinction, they enforce no belief in an endless consciousness of misery. So far as an unbiased criticism can arrive at the exact meaning of language, Christ's language is so indecisive as to the *duration* of future punishment, that any one of these three alternatives may be the real fact, although they may not seem equally probable."

Professor Tyler, whose scholarly eminence is every where acknowledged, enters upon a thorough examination of *αἰών* and

*αἰώνιος*, words that, as he observes, "have their root in the adverb *ἀεί* or *αἰεί*, which, both in etymology and in meaning, is the exact equivalent of the English *aye* and *ever*, of the German *ewig*, the Gothic *aivs*, the Latin *ævum*, etc.,—it is, in fact, the same *word* appearing under various forms, but with the same signification, in these and other branches of the Indo-European family of languages. It is in its essence a *time* word, and means not *any* time, but *every* time; not once or at some time, (that in Greek is *ποτέ*,) but all the time, or at all times, always, forever." The classical use of the words is shown by passages from Hesiod, Homer, Plato, Plutarch, Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, and other Greek writers, by whom they are employed whenever they desire to speak of *duration without end*. On their use in the Septuagint and the New Testament, we have the following:—

Whatever may have been the original or etymological signification of the word *olam*, there can be no doubt of its use in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the word usually employed by the sacred writers to express the longest duration of which they had any conception—duration without limit or end. And this word in its various forms is in all ordinary cases rendered by the Seventy into the Greek *αἰών* and its derivatives. Thus it is employed in the second verse of the Ninetieth Psalm to express in the strongest language the Psalmist's conception of the eternity of the divine existence: "Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God," in the Septuagint version, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*, in Gesenius' Lexicon *ab æternitate ad æternitatem*. This verse in its connection with the preceding verse shows that the Hebrew *olam* is not less, but more, definite in its meaning than the Greek *αἰών*. *Αἰών* in classic Greek sometimes means a life-time; *olam* always means at least a world-time, and in the Scriptures it means *eternity* more frequently than any thing else. In the conception of the Psalmist God's existence endures not only generation after generation through all the generations of men, *ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ*, Heb. *be-dor-va-dor*, but age after age through all the ages that preceded and will follow the creation of the world. So Psa. ciii, 17: the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*. Psa. cvi, 10, *et passim*: his mercy endureth forever, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. Exod. xv, 18: The Lord reigneth for ever and ever, *τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα*. Dan. iv, 3: His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, *αἰώνιος*; v. 34: whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, *αἰώνιος*. Psa. xxvi, 4: Trust ye in the Lord forever, *ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*; in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength, more literally, as in the margin, the

rock of ages, Sept. *αἰώνιος*. But it is needless to multiply examples. These will show not only a frequent, but the prevailing, usage in regard to these words in the Septuagint. They are for the most part employed to express the duration of the divine existence, of the attributes of God, of his government and kingdom, and of the worship, honor, praise, and glory that are due to his name, which are, of course, beyond all question everlasting, without end. And in other passages they mean everlasting in the popular sense in which we speak of the *everlasting mountains*, *everlasting* or, more frequently and less strongly, *endless* disputes—forms of expression which are common in all languages, and which do not change the proper signification of the *words* everlasting and endless, but limit their meaning in certain connections. *Forever*, *everlasting*, etc., are the proper and only proper renderings for them. The Hebrew *olam*, the Greek *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, and the English *forever* and *everlasting* are substantially equivalent; they are the strongest words these languages have to express the longest duration of which the people had any conception; they are the proper words to express the eternity of God and his attributes; and yet no one can misunderstand them when, in a popular and secondary sense, they are predicated of things of shorter duration.

Passing now to the New Testament we find, as we should expect, the same Greek words employed in much the same way as in the Septuagint. In the great majority of instances *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are used to express the duration of the happiness of the righteous, or of the existence of God, or Christ, and the glory due to his name. A little more detail and illustration will enable our readers to judge for themselves. Of the ninety-five instances in which the word *αἰών* occurs, leaving out disputed readings, in sixteen it is used in ascriptions of praise to God and Christ; in five, it is applied to the existence of God or Christ *who liveth forever*; in four it is predicated of the kingdom or dominion of Christ; in one, of the word of God; in eighteen it is used in the sense of *ever*, with a negative *never*, and in a great majority of these cases it is applied to something which Christ is or does; in seven it expresses an indefinite period in ages past, ages long ago; in nine it is applied to the future happiness of the righteous; and in five to the punishment of the wicked. In the remaining passages it is used in the sense of *age* or *world* (properly *world-time*) either present or future, Jewish or Christian. It is not used in the sense of lifetime or generation; the Greek of the New Testament, like that of the Septuagint, uses other words (*ἡλικία* and *γενεά*) to express the age or period of men's lives.

Of the sixty-six undisputed passages in which *αἰώνιος* is employed in the Greek Testament, fifty-one are used in relation to the life and happiness of the righteous in such expressions as *eternal life*, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, *everlasting habitations*, *τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς* or *οἰκίαν αἰώνιον*, *eternal salvation*, *σωτηρίας αἰώνιον*, *eternal inheritance*, *αἰωνίου κληρονομίας*, *the everlasting kingdom*, *εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν*, *his own* (God's) *eternal glory*, *εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον*

*εἰς οἵ δόξαν*, etc., etc.; two have respect to God, *τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ*, or his honor or glory, *ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον*; three or four to the *gospel*, the *covenant*, the *Spirit*, (of Christ or of God,) and *the things which are not seen*; three to past ages long since or eternal, *χρόνοις αἰωνίοις*, or *πρὸ χρονων αἰωνίων*; seven relate to *future punishment*; and in one the word is used to express the duration of the period, *through time and through eternity*, during which Philemon would have and enjoy Onesimus in contrast with the temporary separation which preceded it, *ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν ἵνα αἰωνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς*, *separated for a season that you may have him back forever, not as a servant but a brother beloved and in the Lord.*

This synopsis, in which I have taken the counting of Professor Stuart, (On Future Punishment,) withouttaking the pains to verify it, only revising his classification so that I am willing to be responsible for its substantial correctness, shows beyond dispute that the words under consideration are the words by which the writers of the New Testament were accustomed to express their strongest conceptions of eternity; that if the idea of duration without end is to be found anywhere in the Greek Scriptures, it is expressed in these words; and, furthermore, that if the idea is not expressed in these words, it cannot be expressed by any other words in the Greek language. Especially with those pluralities and reduplications which seem to grow with the growth of the Scriptures and the Church, and to reach their culmination in the concluding book of the sacred canon, the *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* which is used over and over again to express the duration of the torment of the worshipers of the beast and the false prophet, of the worship and service of the saints and their reign with Christ, and of the glory and honor and dominion and power of Him that liveth and reigneth forever and ever,—in such passages we cannot but feel that language has reached its utmost limit in the vivid expression of the "forever evermore, the ages of ages, worlds of worlds, eternities of eternities," which after all do not measure that immeasurable duration.

Now these are the words which our Lord employs, with more calmness, but with no less clearness and certainty, to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. And in view of the usages of the translators of the Old Testament and the writers of the New, when HE WHO IS TO BE THE JUDGE, in describing the scenes of the last judgment, uses such language as this, (Matt. xxv, 41:) "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye accursed, into the fire, the everlasting fire, that has been prepared for the devil and his angels," *τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ*,—the same thing manifestly, under another image, with "the everlasting chains under darkness," *δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον*, in which the angels that kept not their first estate are "reserved unto the judgment of the great day," (Jude 6,) and when he concludes his description of the grand and awful scene by saying: "These shall go away into

punishment everlasting, *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, but the righteous into life everlasting," *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, must he not have meant, must he not have been understood by all who heard him to mean, that as long as the soul shall exist, as long as the blessedness of the righteous shall continue, as long as God shall live and reign, as long as his character shall remain unchanged and his purposes stand fast, as long as he shall be worshiped and enjoyed by the saints and angels in heaven, so long shall the wicked be punished with the devil and his angels? And is not the plain teaching of this text confirmed and established by the unquenchable fire, the undying worm, the impassable gulf, the unpardonable sin, the *everlasting* sin, *αἰώνιον ἁμαρτήματος*, which is now the most approved reading of Mark iii, 29, and therefore inevitable everlasting misery, the wrath of God *abiding* on unbelievers, their death *in* sin wherein there is no life in them, and they *shall not see* life, in other words, *eternal* death, answering to the eternal *sin* and inseparable from it, as effect from cause, which, as we have seen, run parallel in all Christ's teachings, with the eternal life and blessedness of the righteous? What an impeachment of his *honesty* and *integrity*, as well as his wisdom and goodness, to suppose that *He*, the Judge, could have used such language as this, so certain to be understood as teaching the endless punishment of the wicked, if it was not really to be endless! —Pp. 223–228.

No topic of theology is at the present hour so prominently in the public mind as this. In November last, in a small Massachusetts village, a Congregational Council assembled for the purpose of installing a pastor. It was found that the candidate, a gentleman of unimpeachable purity of life, held the question of the eternity of future punishment to be an open one, and that he must so teach if he taught any thing on the subject. The Council declined to install him, and, as we think, very properly. The question was not one of recognition of Christian character, but rather of credentials of correctness as a Christian teacher on a point of faith historically held important in the denomination. It could not consistently have done otherwise than it did. Our own Church admits to membership on the very broad platform of the Twenty-five Articles, on which, with the exception of a single clause, perhaps all evangelical Christendom might stand; yet they whom she sends forth as her accredited teachers are first tested by the more rigid Wesleyan-Arminian standard. Our Universalist friends would readily permit a Trinitarian, and a believer in eternal punishment, in the pew, but would they install him in their pastorate?

The action of the Council, by the aid of the telegraph and the secular press, was given a sudden and wide publicity, and became the occasion of a simultaneous assault all along the line. A large class of newspaper writers are unfriendly to evangelical religion, and would gladly make out that hell is a fiction. Much of the popular literature of the day is permeated with the sentimentalism that arrays a fatherly sympathy against the justice of God as a moral Governor. The Universalism of forty years ago, that denied all punishment after death, and opened heaven with its glories to a Paine and an Ingersoll reeking with blasphemies, has been compelled to change its face, and proclaim for impenitent sinners a punishment beyond the grave. It may be of a thousand years' duration; it may be a million: but somewhere in the ages of eternity it will come to an end. If it can be made clear that there is a certainty of getting out of hell, even at the end of a million of years, the getting in is to multitudes seemingly a matter of small moment. "My friend," once said the venerable Frederic Upham, "I recommend you if hell does not last but a fortnight, to keep out of it."

The plan and purpose of God were most certainly the ultimate salvation of the whole race, which only the perverseness of the race itself could defeat. That perverseness is continually manifest, in spite of all the appliances of infinite love, and there is no known reason why it may not continue the same forever. We carry with us beyond the grave the characters with which we come to our final hour of earth. In so far as any change thereafter is a question of the power of God, the case is not changed at all by the passage into eternity, for omnipotence can no more trespass upon or force moral freedom there than it can here. It is, then, a false putting of the case to say that God can stop men's sinning if he will. He can, indeed, stop it, as he did in Noah's time by the sweeping destruction of the flood; but destruction is not salvation. And who shall say that some men in the exercise of their freedom and indulgence of their hate will not forever choose sin, and determinedly refuse any and all terms of reconciliation with God, even were reconciliation possible after death?

We may be sure that God will be forever true both to himself and to man, and he will, therefore, whatever may be the

outcome, deal with man in accordance with the laws of the nature which he has given him. One of those laws is the permanence of character. We commonly expect him whose character is formed to continue what he has become. The apostasy from Christ of John Wesley or Jonathan Edwards in old age would have shocked the world: it had become a moral impossibility; and it is well known that the conversion of an aged sinner is seldom witnessed. Character hardens and solidifies with the passing years, and opposing motives and appeals steadily lose their power. This law men carry with them into the future world, both the saint into paradise, and the wicked into perdition; and character will abide and go on hardening and solidifying. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Put with this the law of superinduced inability. Closing the eyes to the light, and refusing to hear and obey the truth, weaken and sometimes destroy the power to see and hear and obey. Willful and long persistence in sin results in inability to repent. Some of the Jews in our Saviour's time furnish a sad illustration: "Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, . . . therefore they could not believe." They *did not*—then, they *could not*. Now, if a continued refusal or neglect of the Gospel may thus ingrain the character and induce increasing diminution of power to repent in this world, and the soul carries its laws with it into eternity, how shall he repent there who has here utterly squandered and destroyed his soul's power of repentance?

But repentance is not the prescribed condition of salvation. The rich man in torment repented, but it availed him nothing. It is too often forgotten by debaters on this subject that the moral government under which we are living is one of recovery of fallen and lost men through a redemptive scheme. "The wrath of God abideth" on all those who refuse acceptance of Christ as a Saviour, while no one who comes to him is or will be rejected. Repentance blots out no sin: faith in Jesus blots out all sin. The proclamation of mercy is to all who will take him as their mediator, and the dying sinner of a hundred years, believing, finds mercy, while the sinner of a day, unbelieving, finds none. The point of test is in their

treatment of Christ. And, as here the crowning sin is in rejection of him, the chief element in the final condemnation will be, not the number, or greatness, or long continuance of sin committed, but the neglect of the salvation offered and the failure to love Christ. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema:" and from this lies no appeal. Now, we have "one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus," the crucified Saviour, the living Intercessor, the final Judge. The period is coming when his work of mediation will cease; when, immediately following the final judgment, "he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," said Jesus; and his work of intercession will then be forever done. If, then, salvation is attainable only by faith in him, and his redemptive work ceases with this delivering up of the mediatorial kingdom, deliverance for the unsaved is thenceforth impossible.

There is coming a day of judgment. At that time there will be two classes of men, the righteous and the wicked, standing before the Son of Man, their final Judge. The decisions of that day will be judicial decisions; its awards will be judicial awards; and *both must stand until they are judicially reversed.* Any other principle would make an earthly government a fluctuation and a sham, full of uncertainty and instability; and God will expose his government to no such possibilities or imputations. Among men, if new testimony is found, if the law has been misinterpreted, or if injustice has been done, a remedy is found in a new trial or an appeal to a higher court; nevertheless, the decree stands until it is reversed. But in that great day the Judge will know the law, and will make no mistake in its interpretation, and the whole testimony will be before him. His awards will be judicial awards. There is no higher court; there can be no new trial; there is no reassembling of the tribunal; there will be no suspension of the pronounced doom. The awards of that day must stand forever, without possibility or hope of reversal. The sentence, "Depart from me, ye cursed," will be irrevocable. Pardon on repentance is not the divine plan now, and it cannot be then. Pardon in the exercise of sovereignty, in abrogation of the decree of the

great tribunal, would be a contradiction of himself which God will not perform. And if to any this seems severe and shocking, let him remember the infinite love which gave the Son of God to prevent it, the tears and pleadings of Jesus over lost men, the agonies of Gethsemane, the shed blood of Calvary, the warnings and invitations of the Gospel, and the movings of the blessed Spirit, and that, in spite of all God can do, men refuse to be saved. It *is* shocking; but if men *will* be eternally damned, how can God prevent it?

North American Review, January–February, 1878. (New York.)—1. Charles Sumner. 2. A Crumb for the "Modern Symposium." 3. The Art of Dramatic Composition. Part I. 4. General Amnesty. 5. The English Aristocracy. 6. Reminiscences of the Civil War. 7. The Origin of the Italian Language. 8. Ephesus, Cyprus, and Mycenæ. 9. Capture of Kars, and Fall of Plevna. 10. Currency Quacks, and the Silver Bill.

North American Review, March–April, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Army of the United States. Part I. With Letters of Generals Sherman and Hancock. 2. English and American Universities Compared. 3. Stonewall Jackson and the Valley Campaign. 4. The Death-Struggle of the Republican Party. 5. The Position of the Jews in America. 6. The Political Alliance of the South and the West. 7. The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment.

This Review is well fulfilling its promise of the discussion of living topics of the day. The special article of this number is the last, covering thirty-five pages, and furnished by six different writers, President Porter opening and closing the discussion. Congregationalist, Roman Catholic, Unitarian, Baptist, and Universalist, are represented, while Mr. Frothingham speaks for himself with little thought and sufficient sneer and coarseness to incite the query whether even Mr. Ingersoll could have done that part more gracelessly. Dr. Bellows very thoughtfully remarks: "We confess that our philosophy of man's perfect moral freedom casts very solemn and threatening shadows upon the future of willful and impenitent transgressors. We do not see how men can be made holy against their wills, or be less than miserable, so long as they will not be holy; and our observation and experience of human willfulness in this world does not encourage us to hope that it may not continue for indefinite and practically dateless periods in new states of being. Fools alone make a mock at sin." Sadly true; and why "it may not continue" forever, who can tell, however much he may "hope?"

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, January, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Origen and Universalism. 2. The Primary Source of Religious Evidence. 3. Universalist Conventions and Creeds. 4. Moral Freedom and Moral Evil. 5. Johnson's China. 6. The Vulgate Version and the Catholic Church. 7. Henry Ward Beecher on Future Punishment and the Future Life. 8. The General Convention.

The article on "Moral Freedom and Moral Evil" contains some very forcible utterances on the question of the impreventability of sin in a free moral being, which have, at the present time, a more than usual interest, because of their bearing on current discussions. The position taken is the familiar one that it is impossible for God to work contradictions. But the graveling query spontaneously arises: How can the omnipotence which cannot prevent sinning in this world prevent it or stop it in the future world?

## *English Reviews.*

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. Thirteenth year. January, 1878. (London.)—1. "Disestablishment." 2. John Stuart Mill's Philosophy Tested. 3. The Little Health of Ladies. 4. On the Teaching of Natural Philosophy. 5. China, England, and Opium: The Chefoo Convention. 6. Government Education: Thirty Years Past and Thirty Years to Come. 7. The Discoveries at Mycenæ and Cyprus. 8. The County Franchise. 9. Dog-Poison in Man.

February, 1878.—1. On the Origin of Reason. 2. The Stability of our Indian Empire. 3. Forest and Field Myths. 4. France before the Outbreak of the Revolution. 5. The New Star which Faded into Star-Mist. 6. What is in Store for Europe. 7. The Three Conflicting Theories of Church and State. 8. Madonna Dūnya. 9. England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Cromartie Papers. 2. Harvey and Cesalpino. 3. The French in Indo-China. 4. Correspondence of Charles Sumner. 5. Titian. 6. Third Volume of the Life of the Prince Consort. 7. Stanley's Discoveries and the Future of Africa. 8. The Military Power of Russia. 9. Dr. Schliemann's Exploration of Mycenæ. 10. The Coming Conclave. 11. Principles and Prospects of the Liberal Party.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (London.)—1. Assyriology. 2. Indian Famines. 3. Atheism, Evolution, and Theology. 4. The Eternal Life in the Gospel of St. John. 5. Van Laun's History of French Literature. 6. The Pope, the Kings, and the People. 7. Catechization.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Renaissance in Italy and in England. 2. Scientific Lectures: their Use and Abuse. 3. Schliemann's Mycenæ. 4. March of an English Generation through Life. 5. Sir Erskine May's Democracy in Europe. 6. A French Critic on Goethe. 7. Railway Accidents. 8. Lord Melbourne. 9. The House of Commons and the Obstructive Party. 10. The Meeting of Parliament.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. Democracy in Europe. 2 Charlotte Brontë. 3. The Education of Girls: their Admissibility to Universities. 4. Lessing: His Life and Writings. 5. The Indian Famine: How dealt with in Western India. 6. Charles Sumner. 7. The Telephone. 8. India and our Colonial Empire.

British Quarterly Review, January, 1878. (London.)—1. The Mikado's Empire. 2. The Americans in Turkey. 3. Savings and Savings Banks. 4. Precious Stones. 5. Capital and Labor: The Principles and Facts on Both Sides. 6. Comprehension. 7. Parody and Parodists. 8. Professor Henry Rogers.

The article on "The Americans in Turkey" is highly complimentary to our country, and especially to the missionaries of the American Board, but is only a just recognition of the actual facts. The religious reformation is purposely left out of the account, and attention is confined to some of the incidental and secular results of the labors of the last half century. The explorations of Fisk, Parsons, King, Goodell, Smith, and Dwight, in Asia Minor, Cappadocia, Armenia, and Persia, followed by Robinson in Palestine, together with Thomson's "The Land and the Book," and Van Lennep's "Bible Lands," are noticed at length. The travels of the missionaries were mostly connected with the furtherance of their great work; yet, as men of culture, they noted numberless facts, and gave them to the world. Nor is the value of their labors any the less, because travelers and exploration societies, stimulated by what they have done, have since been crowding in their footsteps, and triangulating and mapping out the country. The contrast between the American and the Oriental is thus vividly described:—

No one can fail to notice, at the outset, the sharp contrast between the American and the Oriental. The Oriental is sluggish almost to indifference; he dreads change, he easily submits to the decrees of fate; he has a profound regard for authority, and is disposed to allow all things to take their own course. To him time is of little value, success is not essential. Abundance of sleep, plenty of food, pipes, coffee, narcotics, long stories, formality, dignity, all these enter largely into the daily life of the dweller in the East. How strangely different the American. Nervous, impatient, short and sharp in speech, always in a hurry, despising formality, careless of his dress, unwilling to sleep till exhausted by overwork, ready to put his dissecting knife into everything, determined to make every undertaking a success, self-confident, filled with the conviction that American ideas are destined to lead the world, working always for definite results, and adapting his means to the end in a most positive way, who can predict the result of bringing this restless New Englander face to face with the slow and dignified Oriental? Strange as it may seem, we believe that the very sharpness of this contrast has been one of the main elements in the success of the Americans in dealing with the people of Turkey. The Oriental needed something bold and positive to arouse him, and this he has found in the Americans; for it must be confessed that whatever may be the short-comings of the citi-

zens of the great Republic, a want of positiveness and self-confidence is not one of them.—Pp. 32, 33.

The literary work done is immense. School books of all grades, books, tracts, and newspapers are published in different languages: Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, Hebrew, Spanish, Turkish, and Kürdish, besides the European. Some of these books are published in several languages, notably, the Bible, which is issued in Turkish, with Arabic, Armenian, and Greek characters, as prepared by Drs. Van Dyck, Goodell, and Schauffler. The amount of printing done from the first at Constantinople and Beirut reaches the enormous amount of four hundred and fifty million pages. Education, as well as the press, is made an auxiliary in the work of evangelization. About three hundred common schools have been established; fifteen girls' boarding schools; a number of high schools for young men; seven theological schools, and three colleges, at Constantinople, Beirut, and Aintab, with a fourth projected, Armenia College, at Kharpoot. Robert College, to which the founder, Mr. Christopher R. Robert, of New York, has given the sum of two hundred thousand dollars, had at the beginning of the war two hundred and twenty-five students, from fourteen different nationalities. We would be glad to notice the work of American physicians, but have space only for the following on the improved condition of woman:—

When the Americans arrived in Turkey they found the women of the country in a degraded condition. There was no public sentiment, either among Moslems or Christians, in favor of the education of women. The general opinion seemed to be that the female sex has almost no intellectual capacity. The first efforts of the Americans to make the women sharers in intellectual progress and refinement were met with opposition and often with derisive laughter. Let us ask, then, What have the Americans accomplished in Turkey in respect to the improvement of women? We answer, They have created a new public sentiment in favor of the education of women.

That such a sentiment now exists to a large extent is shown in a variety of ways. Several thousands of adult women have been taught to read, and this fact attracts a great deal of attention among all classes of the people. The husbands and relations of these female readers are proud of them. "My wife knows how to read," is a remark now often made with evident satisfaction. True, these women have not gone beyond simple reading, but that alone is a great boon: it opens to them a new world.

This new public sentiment is shown by the interest taken in the schools that have been established by the Americans, especially for the education of girls. Annual examinations of these schools are held, and it is on these occasions that the public sympathy manifests itself. Pashas, civil and military officers of high rank, the ecclesiastics and wealthy men of all the different nationalities, are reported as attending their examinations, and as expressing their hearty approval of the efforts that are made by the Americans for improving the condition of the women of Turkey. The American ladies who have had charge of these schools have made great use of the press in enlightening the community on this subject. . . . One fact has struck our attention most forcibly on examining this subject, which is, that those in Turkey who have been quick to avail themselves of the advantages placed before them by the Americans belong uniformly to the *Christian* and not to the *Mohammedan* races, Greeks, Copts, Armenians, and Bulgarians, not Kûrds, Turcomans, Turks, or Arabs.—Pp. 57–58.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review. January, 1878. (London.)—1. Old Testament Morality. 2. Agnosticism and Dogmatism, from a Puritan Point of View. 3. The Parables of Christ, with Special Reference to their Place in his Teachings. 4. Biographies of 1876: Kingsley, Campbell, Martineau, Arnot. 5. The Book of Deuteronomy. 6. The Philosophy of Punishment. 7. African Explorations and Missions. 8. Opportunity the Authoritative Guide of the Church.

Recent criticism disputes the account which the Book of Deuteronomy gives of itself, and ascribes to it a later authorship. Dr. Murphy, the commentator, after examining the several difficulties alleged, strikes out another line of argument showing some of the difficulties the critics must encounter. After showing that inspiration involves at least two things—first, the truth, and next the higher than human scope of the inspired writing, he remarks:—

The only point, however, which is to our present purpose, is the adaptation of the revelation to the present emergency. An inspired book enunciates principles of truth, and modes of applying them to the condition of man. A principle is always the same, but the mode of its application varies with the occasion. Hence, an addition to the volume of inspiration involves, if not new principles, at all events new modes of applying old principles to the new situation of affairs. This is what may be called the development of the truth in Scripture.

The advocates of the late composition of Deuteronomy make much of this law of development. On the fancied ground of the anachronisms already discussed, they have brought down the book to the age of Samuel or Jeremiah or Ezra. This result, however, only involves them in a sea of perplexities. First of all, the few traces of later events alleged to be found in the book turn out to be,

not mistakes of the writer, but hasty misconceptions of the critic. And when these have been discounted, the book itself proves to be composed entirely of instances of that precise stage of development which was needed at the close of the ministry of Moses. It is found to reveal new principles and new modes of applying the old, to provide for new needs of the coming era, and thus to exhibit a process of development adapted only to the time in which the author states it to have been written.

1. Among the principles and modes of application are the following: The great law of love is here laid down. This principle of morality is implied, indeed, in the ten commandments, and affirmed in its minor application to the creature in Lev. xix, 18, but here only explicitly announced in its major application to the Creator. This is finely suited to be a last word of the great lawgiver. A mode of its application is the year of release, by which forbearance toward our dependent brother is learned and practiced. This institution comes in properly on the eve of the settlement. Another principle is, that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." Deut. vii, 3. Man is a moral and accountable being, and his life, therefore, depends, not on eating bread only, but on believing and obeying the revealed will of God. This was drawn from the experience of the wilderness. Another is, that the moral law is the test of prophetic teaching. If a prophet say, "Let us go after other gods," reject him and his teachings, even though it be supported by a sign or a wonder. (Deut. xiii.) This was suitable after the experience of Egypt, and before entering Canaan. It is a principle that man, especially when fallen, needs the teaching of his Maker. Hence the advantage of a written revelation. (Deut. xxx.) This is seasonable, when the first grand installment of the Scripture was handed over to the leaders of the people. All these principles were more suitable for the final addresses of Moses than for any other occasion.

2. Numerous are the provisions which this book makes for the new needs arising at the conquest of the promised land. It introduces in fifteen chapters (xii–xxvi) a whole series of alterations in the institutions of the theocracy adapted to the new state of things. The grand change was the choice of a place where the priest would offer the propitiatory sacrifice, and make intercession with God for the people, and where the passover and other annual feasts should for the future be celebrated. A higher court consisting of the priests and elders of the people is instituted for the trial of more difficult cases. (Deut. xvii.) Directions are given for the renewal of the covenant between God and his people. All these arrangements were adapted to the closing scene of the wilderness life, and to no other time before or after.

3. The whole tenor of the book, therefore, exhibits the development of doctrine requisite for the pause of the people of God on the banks of the Jordan. And when the candid reader calls to mind the vast array of passages in Exodus, Leviticus, and Num-

bers that plainly precede Deuteronomy, and the transactions in the books of Joshua and Judges, which as plainly follow it, he cannot fail to be convinced that this book is the link necessary to connect the law with the history of the chosen people.—Pp. 122–125.

---

## *German Reviews.*

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Riehm and Dr. Köstlin. Second Number. 1878. *Essays:* 1. KATTENBUSCH, Critical Studies on Symbolics, (Second Article.) 2. BRAUN, The Religious and Moral Views of Adam Smith. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. DOEDES, A Mandate of Jesus Christ, by Nicholas Herman. 2. SEIDEMANN, Spengler's Correspondence. 3. KOENIG, The Rules of Pachomius. *Reviews:* 1. MEZGER, History of the German Translations of the Bible in the Reformed Church of Switzerland, reviewed by STRACK. 2. FRENSDORFF, The *Massora Magna*, reviewed by STRACK.

Adam Smith's famous work, "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," was published in 1776. It was the first complete and systematic statement of the principles of political economy, and has had an extraordinary influence upon the development of this science. Though the author of the above article on Adam Smith cannot consent to Buckle's opinion, who calls Smith's book "probably the most important work which has ever been written," he also contends that perhaps the influence of no other work has been "so immediately practical." "What Smith wrote down in his quiet study," he says, "has been taken up and realized by the men of action and of industry; by the statesmen and the representative assemblies. Its fruit we behold in the economical development of the last century; in the economical and social condition of the present age, with its sunny and shady sides. Certainly this condition demands the earnest consideration of theologians, who have to test and to comprehend all departments of life from a moral and Christian stand-point. For is not the economical life of a nation closely connected with its moral and religious condition? If we take, for instance, two of the most striking and the most abnormal economical phenomena of the present day—the swindling stock companies and socialism—which sustain to Smith's system the relation of necessary consequences, they reveal a frightful wreck of moral and religious life. Is Smith in any way responsible for them? At all events, it is of interest to look into his moral and re-

ligious views, and to examine their eventual connection with his economical theories. This is the object of our essay." Accordingly, the author briefly recapitulates the fundamental principles of Smith's economical system, and then gives a full statement of his views on religion and morality. The result at which he arrives is stated by him as follows: "Smith's fault lies not in an irreligious materialism or atomistic egotism, which have been falsely attributed to him, but in his moral and economical optimism. He does not know sin, the radical evil in man and the radical evil in the world. Against this evil in the world, and for an approximate realization of a general well-being, there is no other remedy than the struggle against the sin of egotism. As long as any moral duties are assigned to the State, there can be no doubt that the State has the right and the task to keep down the sinful egotism of individuals for the benefit of others, and for their own moral benefit. This should be done by laws which limit the absolute economical freedom, and thus make their abuse impossible. But as long as the State does not fulfill this duty, exertions should be made to oppose the principle of egotism by means of free associations, and to reduce as much as possible the existing misery."

In a postscript to his article the author briefly refers to a new work by Dr. Oncken, a well-known German historian, on "Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant: The Harmony and the Mutual Relation of their Views on Ethics, State, and Economy," (*Adam Smith und Immanuel Kant: der Einklang und das Wechselverhältniss ihrer Lehren*, etc. Vol. I. Leipsic. 1877.) He enumerates the points in which he agrees and in which he disagrees with Oncken.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) September, 1877.—1. STANLEY, Spiritual Religion; Translation of a Sermon of Dean Stanley, of Westminster. 2. GABEREL, Five Years in Russian America. 3. GODET, A Commentary on the New Testament. 4. STAFFER, Some Notes on the Reform of Worship. 5. SECRETAN, The Philosophy of Liberty.

October.—1. BARDOUX, American Moralists, (Channing and Parker.) 2. GABEREL, Five Years in Russian America. (Second Article.) 3. PRESSENSÉ, A Manifesto of Ecclesiastical Reaction in the Reformed Church. 4. LICHTENBERGER, The Festivals of Upsala.

November.—1. PRESSENSÉ, The Evangelical Preparation at the time of the Patriarchs. 2. CADÉNE, Coligny. 3. RUFFET, The Gospel and Liberty. 4. SCHAFFER, Insanity.

December.—1. PRESSENSÉ, The Evangelical Preparation at the Time of the Patriarchs. 2. GANFIES, The Project of Transferring the Theological Faculty of the Reformed Church from Montauban to Paris. 3. SCHAFFER, Insanity, (Second Article.)

January, 1878.—EDOUARD NAVILLE, Moral Liberty. 2. STAFFER, The Christianity of the First Centuries. 3. MILLARD, Catholic Theology and Worship.

February.—1. EDOUARD NAVILLE, The Israelites in Egypt. 2. SUCHARD, Darwinism. 3. IRMA S., The Curé and the Pastor.

The author of the article, The Israelites in Egypt, undertakes to show how much the interesting discoveries which have been made in Egypt enlarge the knowledge which hitherto had been derived on this subject from the Bible. The range of his discussion is, however, wider than the title of the article seems to indicate, for it really traces the entire history of the Semites in Egypt. The first immigration of people of this race into Egypt, according to him, took place during the reign of the Twelfth Dynasty. In a tomb of an officer of the Twelfth Dynasty we see a picture representing a Semitic family of a nation called the Amso, or shepherds, which had just settled in the country, to the number of thirty-seven persons, and which an overseer presents to the officers. These strangers, of a type very much resembling the Israelites, carrying with them their arms and musical instruments. The women are wearing long variegated dresses; the children are sitting on donkeys, and the chief, Abesha, which recalls the biblical name Abishai, offers to the officers two wild goats. It has sometimes been supposed that these strangers must have belonged to the family of Jacob; but the Twelfth Dynasty long preceded the time of Abraham, and many centuries had yet to pass before the Israelites entered the valley of the Nile. The first Semitic immigrants settled in the Delta; they were employed to tend

the cattle, and gradually they became so firmly settled that, notwithstanding the great wars which followed, they were never wholly expelled from the country, and even at the present day the population which resides around Lake Menzaleh preserves the Semitic type. Thus, gradually, during the reign of the Pharaohs of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties, lower Egypt became densely peopled by Semites, who undoubtedly remained in connection with the nations of the same race which lived on the eastern border of Egypt. About two thousand years before our era a people coming from Mesopotamia, and driven thence by the trouble which characterized the foundation of the first Chaldean empire, advanced toward Egypt. Perhaps they were called, and undoubtedly they were aided, by their co-nationalists, and settled in the Delta. At all events, they conquered Egypt. These were the famous Hyksos. Herodotus, Diodorus, and Josephus call them barbarians, and say that they devastated the country with fire and sword. They especially destroyed what was dearest to the Egyptians, their religious monuments. Our present knowledge of the ancient history of Egypt does not suffice to explain why the flourishing kingdom of Egypt was unable to offer a more successful resistance to this invasion. While the Hyksos ruled the Delta, descendants of the Pharaohs, being to a greater or lesser extent vassals of the Hyksos, maintained themselves at Thebes. It was during the reign of the Hyksos that Abraham, then Joseph, and then Jacob and his family, arrived in Egypt. Of course, the Hyksos were detested by the Egyptians, and the Egyptian monuments, therefore, refer but rarely to them. Still they furnish some information. Their capital was neither Memphis nor Thebes, which latter city they probably never occupied, but Tanis, now San, on one of the eastern branches of the Nile, in the center of the Semitic population which were their most faithful adherents. Like all barbarous conquerors of civilized countries, the Hyksos were in many ways affected by the superior civilization of the Egyptians; they adopted the language of the country, and though they preserved the worship of their national god, Set, (or Baal,) they erected to him temples resembling those erected to the Egyptian gods. Only a few years ago, M. Mariette, one of the most successful discoverers of Egyptian antiquities, found

at San sphinxes dating from Aphophis, the last king of the Hyksos, which had been placed at the entrance of the great temple of that city, and which bear hieroglyphic inscriptions of the same character and in the same language as those of the Pharaohs. According to the Christian writer Syncellus, it was this king Aphophis who made Joseph his prime minister, and during whose reign Jacob and his family settled in Egypt. This, of course, accords very well with the account of the Scriptures. A Hyksos or Semite king had strong reasons to be favorable to the kindred Israelites, and to favor their settlement in Egypt. Professor Brugsch, or as he calls himself since he has entered the service of the Khedive, Brugsch Bey, believes himself to have discovered in the Egyptian monuments a direct reference to Joseph. In the tomb of an officer who must have lived under the last kings of the Hyksos, though he was in the service of one of the native princes who revolted against them, we read: "I have collected corn, for I am a friend of the god of the harvest; I have been vigilant at the time of the sowing, and when there was a famine for several years, I have furnished wheat to the city." Brugsch thinks these words must refer to the famine at the time of Joseph. To the end of the rule of the Hyksos the book of Exodus refers only by this brief statement, that a new king arose up over Egypt who knew not Joseph. From the Egyptian annals we receive a detailed account of this interesting turning-point in Egyptian history. A native prince, Rasgenen, who was governor of Thebes, under the sovereignty of Aphophis, believing the time to have come for shaking off the yoke of the detested foreigners, provoked a war by a religious revolt. He declared boldly that he would never worship any other god but Amun-Ra, the national deity of Thebes, and this declaration quickly led to the war which ended in the overthrow of the Hyksos. For one hundred and fifty years the Egyptians fought for the recovery of their national independence; then Avaris, the last stronghold of the Hyksos fell, and, instead of being the masters, they became the subjects of the Egyptian Pharaohs. Of course, the new rulers of the native dynasties "knew not Joseph," but probably did every thing they could to destroy every reminiscence of him. From the researches of Lepsius it results that the king who particularly oppressed the Israelites

was Rameses II., second king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and it is quite generally assumed that the king during whose reign the exodus took place was Manephthah I., the son of Rameses II. The place where the Israelites passed the Red Sea is at present the subject of an interesting controversy between the Egyptologists; it is believed to have been a little more to the north than has been heretofore assumed.

## Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### MOHAMMEDANISM.

At a time when the whole Mohammedan world has suffered a terrible blow by the defeat of Turkey, it is of great interest to cast a glance at the condition of the Mohammedans under the two greatest Christian Governments—the British and the Russian. It is a remarkable fact that the Queen of England rules over a larger number of Mohammedans than any Mohammedan prince, and that by far the best institutions of learning for Mohammedans are now found in the dominions of Russia and England. A distinguished German traveler and ethnological writer, E. von Schlagintweit, has recently published a very interesting article on the Mohammedans of the Russian and British empires, the substance of which we give in the following lines:—

In European Russia the Mohammedans number 2,359,372, or three and a third per cent. of the total population. Of this number 710,905 are in the Province of Ufa, 451,786 in Kazan, 250,802 in Orenburg, and 116,206 in Taurida, inclusive of the Crimea. In Asiatic Russia there are 1,960,000 (or ninety-three per cent. of the total population) Mohammedans in the Caucasus; 61,803, or barely two per cent. in Siberia; 1,200,000, or seventy per cent., in the Kirghiz Steppe; and 2,350,000, or ninety per cent., in Turkestan. Assuming the total population of Russia to be 86,177,906, we find that the Mohammedans form 9.1 per cent. of the total population. These 8,000,000 Mohammedans are, with the exception of a very few, Sunnites, who regard themselves as the only true descendants of the prophet, and who regard the Sultan of Turkey as the head of their Church. The relation of Mohammedanism to the State Church is determined by article 40, *et seq.*, of the first volume of the Russian law, as follows: "The ruling faith in the Russian empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of faith. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans, so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors." This law, however, is interpreted in such a manner as to mean that religious liberty is assured only so long as a member of an unorthodox Church

adheres to the faith in which he was born; but all unorthodox Churches are forbidden to receive as members proselytes from other Churches. A severe penalty is imposed on any one who leaves a Christian for a non-Christian religion. Lutherans and Roman Catholics are forbidden to convert to Christianity a Mohammedan who is a Russian subject, while a non-Russian Mohammedan may be received in any of the Christian Churches permitted in the empire. These laws have been very strictly executed. On several occasions Tartars, who had embraced Christianity, and had afterward returned to their original faith, were punished by imprisonment, while no attention was paid to the excuse that the relapse had been occasioned by an unbearable pressure exercised by orthodox priests, as well as by their avariciousness. On the other hand, the Government aids the orthodox clergy in every possible manner in their efforts to convert the unfaithful. In Kazan, one of the principal seats of the Mohammedan population of European Russia, the brotherhood of St. Gurij was formed in 1870 for the purpose of converting the Mohammedans and Pagans on the Volga. This brotherhood had established up to 1874 115 schools, with their own means, which were attended by 1,992 male and 339 female Tartars, besides members of other nationalities.

The civil rights of the Mohammedans are like those of the Jews, limited by special laws. They are, indeed, eligible to municipal and government offices under the same conditions as Christians; but in city councils, *e. g.*, the non-Christian members must not exceed one third of the total number of members, while the office of mayor is entirely closed to them. The criminal statistics are particularly interesting. Among all the inhabitants of the empire the Mohammedans occupy the lowest rank with regard to the more serious crimes, there being but one conviction among 5,779 Mohammedans against 2,710 orthodox Christians. With regard to the less serious offenses, the Mohammedans occupy the fifth rank; but even this unfavorable relation is caused by the numerous convictions for evasion of military duty. Theft, however, is also of common occurrence among them. The Mohammedans are generally very prompt in observing their duties to the State, with the exception of those arising from the general liability to military service. The service in the regular army is to this day so unpopular among the Tartars of the Crimea, that in 1876 the Government was forced to take severe measures to prevent a wholesale emigration to Turkey. An official report states that the Tartars feared above all things that they would be forced to fight against their co-religionists, the Turks, and that they would be forced to eat pork, which is to them worse than death. But even before the declaration of war against Turkey, and during this war, the excitement was said to have subsided, and they were, with very few exceptions, loyal. The same was the case with the Mohammedans in Asiatic Russia.

In matters pertaining to their religion, the Mohammedans are granted complete liberty, although the Government takes care to be informed on the entire *personnel* of the clergy, their actions, etc. The highest ecclesi-

astical body in the Eastern governments of European Russia is the "Mohammedan Ecclesiastical College of Ufa." This College is elected, and fills all offices under its jurisdiction without the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Government. For the Mohammedan clergy of Central Asia the cities of Bokhara and Samarkand are to this day centers of learning; and the heads of the institutions of learning at these places are regarded as the preservers of the true faith. The colleges for theology and Mohammedan law (Madrasa or Medresseh) number several hundred. (In European Russia there are two hundred and fifty, of which several are attended by hundreds of students.) In these colleges Mohammedan science flourishes, without having ever been touched by so much as a breath of Western culture. The Government does not interfere in any manner in the inner affairs of these schools; does not oppose a journey to Mecca, and even permits priests, (Mollahs,) who have finished their education in Constantinople, Arabia, or Egypt, to hold a position upon their return to Russia. It was found that the Ulemas (the learned men) connected with the mosques or schools readily submit to any government, as this alone could secure to them the use of their legacies, (Vakuf,) their main source of income. Those brethren, however, who have had themselves declared saints, have become, in all Mohammedan countries, a perfect nuisance, and the sworn enemies of a well-regulated Government. The title of saint (Ishan) is easily obtained. The motives to obtain it are, however, very frequently the most dishonorable, while the saints themselves in many cases bear a very poor reputation. In Central Asia the majority of robberies are committed by the saints, and they are, therefore, avoided by the stationary population. The nomads, on the other hand, receive them with open arms, and here, among the roving sons of the Steppe, they find their true home. The Russian Government at first did not oppose them. The decrees of 1781 and 1785, on the contrary, opened to them the newly acquired Kirghiz Steppes. Their influence here was a very pernicious one. The Government, however, treats them at present more strictly. In 1873 a case occurred in Orenburg, where such a saint was banished to a government having no Mohammedan inhabitants. In the same manner the Russian Government proceeded against the saints in the Caucasus, while in Turkestan it watches the fanatical order of Nakshbandi very closely.

The popular school system among the Mohammedans was entirely reorganized by an Imperial decree of November 20, 1874. This decree placed the schools of the Tartars, the Bashkirs, and Kirghiz under the Imperial Ministry of Education, which informed its subordinates of this Act as follows: "The subordination of the Tartar non-Russian schools under this ministry is not only important in an educational, but also in a political, point of view. The Mussulmans' schools have been, up to this time, without any Government supervision, and, therefore, promoted among the people an anti-Russian sentiment, and a fanaticism which prevented the assimilation of the Tartar, etc., with the other inhabitants of Russia." According to Mohammedan views, every Mollah (priest)

is at the same time a teacher, while the school is near the mosque. Through these schools the Mollahs endeavor to bring their community under their influence, and to keep them away from their Russian neighbors. They are also decidedly opposed to any government supervision of these schools. The Government at first tried to establish teachers' seminaries for the education of teachers in these schools; and the decree of 1870, which ordered the establishment of these seminaries, provided, in order to do away with all prejudices, that the teachers of the Russian language should be, as far as possible, Mohammedans, and the Mollahs be permitted to attend all the lessons, so that they may convince themselves that nothing objectionable is taught. Even now the teachers in the Madrasas of the principal cities, like Kazan, speak Russian fluently, although they are all Mohammedans. The authorities are also actively engaged in the preparation of reading-books containing, besides tales and fables, incidents from Russian history, as well as facts from geography and natural history. This is a decided improvement, as, according to all authorities, like Shaw, Lerch and Vambery, the entire Turkish-Tartaric literature breathes "a spirit of religious mysticism, rose-colored sensual love, and reckless bravery emanating from the most bitter hate of the unbelievers." Even such old libraries as that of Kazan are completely wanting in works on the history and geography of Mohammedan countries; but it is expected that this want will be relieved in time by the Mohammedan students in the Russian high and secondary schools. In 1871 the Oriental faculty of the University of St. Petersburg was attended by thirty-six students. In the same year there were ninety-two Mohammedan students in the Russian gymnasia, of which the educational district of Kazan, with its forty-three per cent. of the total Mohammedan population, had forty-seven.

In East India 40,750,000 Mohammedans are British subjects, and about 7,000,000 Mohammedans are ruled by native princes. Of this number, 36,000,000 are distributed over Northern India. They predominate principally on the Western border, forming not less than eighty per cent. (around Peshawer even ninety-four per cent.) of the total population at any point between the Himalaya Mountains and the Indian Ocean. In the Punjab this figure falls to seventy, then to forty, and afterward in Hindustan to twenty and ten per cent. It is a strange fact that these low figures are found in the principal seats of the former Grand Moguls, who were deposed by the British. In Bengal, east of Calcutta, there is another wide belt, entering also from the sea-shore to the Himalayas, where Mohammedans nowhere fall below fifty per cent. of the total population, and in many cases reach eighty per cent., while in Central and Southern India they contribute but three per cent. of the total population. This distribution is explained by the fact that the Grand Moguls indeed settled in the principal region of Brahminism, but, in spite of all forcible measures, they could bring about but few conversions to their faith. The north-western part of the empire, however, where all the successive conquerors of India first entered upon this country, was a more favorable

field for Mohammedanism. Mohammedanism found its readiest converts among the lower classes, who had been up to that time held in subjection, and who hailed the new faith as a liberator from bondage and serfdom, and one which knew no caste.

A law of 1834 declared that religion should make no difference in the rights and privileges of the subjects of the East Indian Company; and Queen Victoria in her proclamation of November 1, 1858, upon assuming the government of India, reiterated this principle in the most emphatic manner. In conformity therewith the authorities were forbidden to speak of the non-Christian inhabitants of the Empire as Pagans, while the Government proceeded to remove the obstacles which excluded the Mohammedans from the Government offices. The appointment to the higher and well paid offices in India requires an examination, the necessary qualifications for which may be obtained by attending the secondary and higher schools. These schools were patterned, however, too much after similar European institutions; but in 1873 Hindu and Mohammedan works were substituted in place of the Latin and English classical works, and already more Mohammedans than Hindus apply for Government positions. The Anglo-Indian Government grants to all religious denominations the fullest liberty in the management of their own affairs. While formerly a Government commission had the casting vote in the boards of trustees of religious establishments, these functions were transferred, by a law of 1863, to a committee, whose members are in the first place appointed by the Government, and then have the power to fill vacancies. With regard to the political trustworthiness of the Mohammedans in India, it has been generally assumed that the British were hated by their Mohammedan subjects as their tyrants and oppressors. The Sepoy rebellion in 1857, the Patna conspiracy of 1863, and the assassination of numerous English officials by Mohammedans, notably that of the Viceroy, Lord Mayo, in 1872, were cited as proofs for this supposition. These acts are, however, offset by others of great loyalty. As in Russia, the Mohammedans furnish the smallest number of convicts, but, on the other hand, they form the greater part of the Anglo-Indian army, as well as of the native police, and, although while in camp it is necessary to subject them to strict discipline, they make excellent soldiers when under fire.

## Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

A new Commentary to the Gospel of Matthew (*Commentar über das Evangelium des Matthäus*) has been published by Professor C. F. Keil. The author is well known as one of the foremost representatives of the strictest Lutheran orthodoxy, who does not make the slightest concession to the critical and compromising schools of German theology, but

defends, in all particulars, the landmarks of orthodox Protestantism. Keil maintains that the first Gospel was written in the exact form which it now has, by Matthew, and that the assumption of a Hebrew original of the first Gospel rests on a confusion of it with the Gospel of the Hebrews. He repels the idea that there is any discrepancy between the statements of Matthew and those of the other Gospels, and contends that all the sermons and addresses reported in Matthew must be regarded as having been literally delivered in the shape in which the sacred volume transmits them to us. The thorough scholarship of the author, who has a very comprehensive knowledge of Hebrew antiquities, is admitted even by his opponents.

A new work on the "Life and Works of Tertullian" has been published by A. Hauck. (*Tertullian's Leben und Schriften*, 1877.) It is the fruit of many years' special studies, and a review of the work by Professor Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* says of it that it indicates a considerable progress over the treatment of this subject by Neander and Böhringer.

The Cardinal Archbishop of Cambrai, Peter d'Ailli, who was one of the representative men in the long struggle for the reformation of the Church in the fourteenth century, has been made the subject of a special work by Dr. P. Tschakert, a lecturer in the theological faculty of the University of Leipsic. (*Peter von Ailli*, Gotha, 1877.) The author had previously published a Latin dissertation on the "Theology of Peter d'Ailli," (*Petrus Alliacensis de ecclesia quid docuerit*, 1877,) and two articles in theological quarterlies of Germany on writings falsely attributed to the Cardinal of Cambrai. All these essays had been very favorably received, and had awakened a wish that their author might treat the subject in a comprehensive biographical work. This wish is now fulfilled in the above work, which is hailed in Germany as a very valuable contribution to the history of the Roman Church in the Middle Ages.

A historical and statistical account of the Lutheran Church of Russia, by the Rev. F. Hunnius, (*Die evangelische Lutherische Kirche Russlands*, Leipsic, 1877,) is a little work of great interest for the Protestant world. The Lutheran Church of Russia is numerically stronger than is generally known. According to Hunnius the population connected with it numbers 4,024,035. The Church embraces nearly the whole population of Finland and the three Baltic provinces, and has given to Russia many of its ablest statesmen. The work contains also a brief statement of the other Protestant Churches of Russia, the Reformed, United Evangelical, the Scotch Presbyterian, the Wurtemberg Pietists, and the Mennonites.

A Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. P. Scholz, has published a work on idolatry and witchcraft among the Hebrews and the neighboring nations, (*Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebräern, Regensburg*, 1877.) Though deficient in its first part, which treats of idolatry in gen-

eral, and of witchcraft, it is recommended by the theological journals of Germany for the abundance of material which it has collated from the ecclesiastical and secular writers, and from Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian sources.

## DENMARK.

The Lutheran Church of Denmark has had since 1871 a theological Quarterly Review, which is entitled *Theologisk Tidskrift*, and is edited by Dr. Charles H. Kalkar. The editor was formerly pastor of a Lutheran congregation, but has during the last seven years devoted himself entirely to the publication of this theological Review and to other literary work. He is known in the theological world by an able work on Roman Catholic missions, and other publications relating to Church history. His Review was at first intended to fill a gap which had been caused a few years before by the discontinuance of a theological journal published by Professor Scharling, and containing little more than notices of new books. Dr. Kalkar's new review aimed from the start at a wider compass. It was to bring essays from every department of theology, reports on the present condition of the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic Churches, and discussions of all questions relating to the Church of Denmark. The seven volumes of the theological articles which have thus far appeared contain contributions from a number of distinguished theologians. A translation of the titles of the articles contained in the volume of 1877 will give some idea of its contents: Rindom, The Doctrine of the Irvingites, especially in Denmark; P. Trogel and Bishop Brammes, The Use of the Word "Friend" in the New Testament; Fich, The Historical Reality of the Resurrection of Christ, (with special references to an exegetical work by Bang, published in Christiana;) Madsen, On the Reading of the Bible; P. Kofoed-Hansen, On the Idea of an Everlasting Unhappiness; Dr. Kalkar, Pulpit and Politics; Koch, Memoir of Professor Clausen; Hasle, State, People's, and Free Churches; Dr. Kalkar, Börresen and the Danish Mission; H. V., The Origin of the Fourth Gospel—arguing, chiefly from inner reasons, that it was not written by the Apostle John, but by a highly educated contemporary, who was a native of Asia Minor and a resident of Jerusalem; Bohn, The Evangelical Movement in Italy, especially in Rome; Condition of the German Universities in the Fourth Decennium of the Present Century.

## Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*Essentials and Non-Essentials in Religion.* Six Lectures delivered in Music Hall, Boston. By James Freeman Clarke, Author of "Orthodoxy: Its Truths and Errors;" "Steps of Belief," "Ten Great Religions," "Christian Doctrine of Prayer," "Common Sense in Religion," etc. 16mo., pp. 148. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1878.

These Lectures receive this permanent form for several reasons, as the publishers inform us, but "especially" because of "the warm approval expressed by persons of other denominations" than the Unitarian. Dr. Clarke does not here for the first time discuss the topics presented. A gentleman of high scholarly culture, an author of acknowledged ability, an eminent minister in his denomination, with hosts of personal friends and admirers, on whatever subject he writes or speaks he commands a generous and respectful attention. Possessed with an ardent desire to break down the barriers or bridge the chasm between orthodoxy and liberalism, he has labored diligently to find or to create some common ground where both may meet in the "communion of saints." Such is the endeavor of the present volume. Its title asserts that there are "essentials" in the faith of the Christian Church, and Dr. Clarke undertakes their disclosure, with an apparently entire forgetfulness that Protestant Christendom has for a generation had its opinions pretty well settled on the whole subject. And, of course, notwithstanding his often emphasized dogma that "Christianity is a life," whoever rejects any one of those essentials cannot be a good Christian, however good a Jew, or Buddhist, or Mohammedan, or Pagan, he may be.

Evangelical Christians of every name and land agree in holding certain truths, which they regard as essential to the Christian system, such as the divine inspiration and authority of the holy Scriptures, the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, his incarnation and vicarious atonement, his mediatorial intercession and reign, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, justification by faith alone in Christ as the only Saviour, and supernatural regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Take them away, and what is left is, in their judgment, not Christianity. Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, no more doubt them than they do the sun's rising in the east; and they cannot, without imminent peril to spiritual religion, place any one of them in the category of non-essentials, with theories and philosophies which attempt their

adjustment in a theological system. Acceptance of Dr. Clarke's Essentials requires the rejection of nearly every truth deemed by evangelical Christians necessary and fundamental. We note a few: Jesus, he teaches, was "Son of God, and divine—because filled full of the divine truth and love;" and he denies his "deity of person." "Christ's death did not make it possible for God to pardon sinners." "Saving faith in Jesus Christ is to believe as he believed, trust in God as he trusted, hope as he hoped, and love as he loved;" and this is his exposition of "faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." "We deny that the belief of any proposition is essential to human salvation;" and, as though John Wesley held the same position, he is quoted as saying that "a string of opinions is no more Christian faith than a string of beads is Christian practice." Mr. Wesley is also adduced as a remarkable illustration of the faith above described; but his own statement is as unlike it as is a circle unlike a straight line. He says of himself that he "did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation," and he defined faith as "a full reliance on the blood of Christ—a trust in the merits of his life, death, and resurrection —a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for us and living in us." Dr. Clarke agrees with Mr. Wesley in what Christian faith is *not:* will he also accept his statement of what Christian faith *is?* These references are enough. To stand upon Dr. Clarke's platform we must believe the Bible not divinely inspired or of divine authority, refuse honor to the eternal Son of God, and deny the Lord that bought us.

One hardly knows which to admire more, the magnificent bravery or the calm, innocent simplicity that, from the Music Hall platform, summons Christendom with such cool confidence to renounce its belief in what it holds essential and necessary, for the high privilege of brotherhood with those who reject the faith of all the ages. Great compassion is due those "persons of other denominations" whose "warm approval" is given to their being told that their "Christianity consists essentially in being converted, not in leading an upright life," and that if a sinner asks what he must do to be saved, "no one can exactly say what is to be done." Many of Dr. Clarke's representations of the orthodox faith are the merest caricatures, as he assuredly should know; and no amount of brilliant rhetoric can excuse them. He exercises a great facility in using the well-known language and terms of orthodoxy, whose meaning has been settled and

uniform for ages, in a sense of his own, so that many things that he says convey entirely different ideas to different persons. However useful this may be to a politician seeking partisan success, or to a lawyer laboring to confuse a jury, it is not the usage of men desirous of exactness in speech, or of imparting exact ideas.

---

*Faith and Philosophy.* Discourses and Essays by HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., LL.D. Edited, with an Introductory Notice, by GEORGE L. PRENTISS, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, in the City of New York. 8vo., pp. 496. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1877.

Henry B. Smith was born in 1815, and died in 1877. He was a native of Portland, Maine; was a graduate of Bowdoin, in a class marked for talent, and studied theology at Bangor and at Andover. Thence he went to Germany and studied at Halle and Berlin. He was the valued pupil of Neander, Tholuck, and Ulrici. Under these eminent teachers he prosecuted with enthusiasm the study of Church history, theology, and philosophy. On his return he spent five happy years in the pastorate, and then filled successive professorships at Andover, Amherst, and New York. In New York he established the Presbyterian Review, which afterward became The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review. The volume before us is a noble monument of his life and labors. The introduction, including a brief biography by his fellow-professor, is a warm-hearted tribute to his high personal qualities, as well as an appreciative survey of his works. As his career was noble, and his position pre-eminent, so his productions are held as standards.

Of the pieces here presented, six are discussions of theological topics, and six are adverse reviews. The first, on Faith and Philosophy, which gives title to the book, is his master-piece in direct discussion. His reviews handle the English rationalists, Sir William Hamilton, Professor Draper, Whedon on the Will, Renan, and Strauss. Hereby the Editor of this Quarterly finds himself in highly respectable, but, with the exception of Sir William, decidedly unacceptable, company.

The review of "Whedon on the Will" was one of several replies to that work, some four or five, we believe, published in the Calvinistic Quarterlies soon after its publication. We then pronounced it, and still think it, the ablest of them all, without saying to how much of a compliment that amounted. It was the only one to which we thought proper to offer any reply, which we did in our Quarterly, to the extent, if we rightly recol-

lect, of some fifteen fine-print pages. It is the only one, we believe, that has attained the honor of a re-publication. It is the only one which, so far as we know, was claimed by its friends to be a successful refutation. This we esteem a one-sided claim. It never entered our head to imagine that the reply was in any degree an *answer* to the book reviewed. On the contrary, in our reply we stated that we considered that the article was simply a re-statement of overthrown positions, overthrown in the book itself. Nearly every argument of the review could be completely answered simply by a quotation from the work reviewed. We said that his article was thus "refuted before it was written, like an infant reprobate damned before it was born." We should have added a second article, but were deterred by the conviction that those who read Dr. Smith's article would not read ours, and *vice versa*. We were like two advocates pleading the same case before different juries: each would win a victory more easy than profitable in his own court. The article itself is a dogged defense of the clock-hammer human freedom, according to which the will chooses as the hammer strikes, with no power otherwise, and men are damned for choosing the only way they could choose. As an answer, it is failure in the whole, and failure upon every point, with, perhaps, a single exception. We could have easily shown this in a second or third article. But there is another and perhaps better way to answer it, if answer were needed. Those who have read our volume know that we have therein given full quotations from the ablest necessitarians that have ever written, Hobbes and the Edwardses, classified and assigned them their proper place, and then furnished to each the refutation. Did stereotype permit us to publish an enlarged edition of our work, we could take Dr. Smith's article and cut it in slices, and assign each quoted slice its proper place in addition to its predecessors, and the same logical mill that crushed them would dispose of him. We should seldom need more than a sentence or two to show that our Reviewer was answered before he wrote. But we doubt not that our ascended brother, in the higher and purer atmosphere to which he has been translated, sees these things more clearly than either of us could see them in this our present terrene twilight.

---

*Substitution:* A Treatise on the Atonement. By MARSHALL RANDLES. 8vo., pp. 255. London: J. Grose Thomas & Co.

This is both an able and timely production. The subject is, indeed, an old one in the arena of theological conflict, and many-

sided as well, and the controversy on the nature of the atonement is very far from being ended. In some of its phases, perhaps, nothing can be added to what former writers have said; but recent authors, as Robertson, Maurice, Jowett, Young, Bushnell, and Dale, have brought so prominently before the public mind theories adverse to the doctrine of the substitution of Christ in his sufferings and death for man, that a careful re-statement of the doctrine has become highly desirable. This task Mr. Randles has attempted, with the purpose of supplementing, rather than superseding, previous works. Nevertheless, making the element of substitution his central point, he so far traverses the entire field that his volume must be regarded as the most important publication of recent years on the subject of the atonement. He rests, as might be expected, on the Scriptures as his one sure foundation, rather than the philosophy upon which opponents to his view so resolutely plant themselves; but he also holds and shows that a true philosophy accords with and upholds the doctrine advanced.

After an introductory chapter on the "Rationale of the Atonement," Mr. Randles clears his way by a series of discriminating "Definitions and Distinctions," in which atonement, substitution, satisfaction, propitiation, and expiation appear, with the sense indicated in which the terms are used. This chapter alone is worth the cost of the volume, because of the clearness and scientific precision of its contents, thus preventing difficulty at the outset, and avoiding confusion in the future. Then in successive chapters is considered Substitution as implied in Christ our Sacrifice, our Ransom, and our Representative, with a full examination of the different passages of Scripture involved. All along he finds the doctrine of vicariousness, of transfer of guilt and punishment, that is, of obligation to suffer the penal effects of sin and the actually suffering them. That moral character is transferable he constantly denies. One of the most valuable portions of the book is in its treatment of the relation of substitution to the claims of justice, the problem being thus stated: "Given: man in such a condition, (having disobeyed the law, and exposed himself to the consequences thereof,) under such a government, (perfect in justice as in every thing else,) and such a disposition on the part of the Governor to spare and restore him: how, in our conception, and according to our available knowledge, was it possible for God to effect the benevolent end?" It is the question of every thoughtful human soul as well as of the theologian; and

Mr. Randles' plain and discriminating answer to it is, that "God can and does forgive sin on the ground created by the vicarious sufferings of the Divine-Human Christ; but on such conditions as consist with the free agency of man." The scriptural, logical, and beautiful elucidation of this answer is as effective as it is complete. The harmony of this doctrine with that of Reconciliation, and its relation to Sanctification, are next considered, following which are discussed the theories of pardon on prerogative and on repentance, and the moral-power theory, as taught by Young, Bushnell, and others.

Mr. Randles holds, as we think, the true and only tenable ground. We are able only to present his volume in brief outline, which we do with the special commendation of it to our readers as fairly and ably abreast with the present state of the controversy.

---

*Eternal Hope.* Five Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey, November and December, 1877. By the Rev. FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, etc. 12mo., pp. lviii. 225. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1878.

The most surprising thing connected with these sermons, even more than their delivery, is that Canon Farrar should "*unexpectedly* find himself entangled in a controversy" over them. So strange a misreckoning of British religious opinion as to suppose that their bold, outspoken heterodoxy proclaimed in Westminster Abbey would awaken no antagonism, save, perhaps, in the gentlest criticism, is not easily accounted for. Their titles are "What Heaven Is;" "Is Life Worth Living?" "'Hell'—What it is Not;" "Are there Few that be Saved?" and "Earthly and Future Consequences of Sin." They have elegant rhetoric, vigorous declamation, and fervent feeling, but are singularly free from the solid thought and logical argument which an American congregation expects from the average pulpit. Their purpose, except in the first, was to combat "the popular view" of future retribution, namely, according to Dr. Farrar, its material fire and physical tortures, its endless duration, its certainty for the mass of mankind, and its irreversible finality at death. The sermons occupy little more than half the volume. The decision to publish them led to an extended preface, in which the author's views are more fully and elaborately set forth, and, also, to several appendixes bearing more or less directly on the question of continued probation after death. Several of their features are discussed in our Synopsis of the Quarterlies.

How widely the opinion prevails that hell is a place of physical torment we do not know. The Scriptures do employ such weighty expressions as these: "Outer darkness," the "place of torment," "everlasting fire," "the furnace of fire," "the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth." None of these is taken from the book of Revelation. Now, whether they should be interpreted literally or figuratively, who shall say? If the former, they are terrible enough without the least addition by medieval painter or modern preacher, if addition be even possible. If the latter, they are no less terrible, for types and figures only shadow forth the reality, and the mental woe suggested by such a word as "fire" must be indescribable. It should be observed, moreover, that these expressions are found in plain prose, where we do not commonly look for poetic figures; but in no case can any reasonable interpretation take from them their fearful significance.

Dr. Farrar protests with some vehemence, over and again, against dependence on texts and passages accepted as teaching the endlessness of future retribution, to the neglect of the whole scope and tenor of the Scriptures, and the known character of God. It might be said that that scope and tenor must be gathered from the body of texts and passages which make up the Bible, and it is certainly wrong to wrench any text from its meaning in its connection. Now, the tenor of Scripture is that God in infinite love has provided a remedy for sin, which, with intense earnestness, he urges upon sinners, telling them most plainly that only by it have they possible hope of salvation. With this as its scope, no reliance on special texts is needed to learn that hurt must follow rejection of Christ, while they may and do show the measureless magnitude of that hurt. Yet he falls into the very error which he declaims against. Besides collecting half a dozen pages of texts, including "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," to show that hell is not endless, he is compelled by the force of "one or two passages" to declare that he is "unable to adopt the Universalist opinion;" and in one of the four places where he repudiates it he assigns as a reason that "it is impossible for us to estimate the hardening effect of obstinate persistence in evil, and the power of the human will to resist the law and love of God." If the notion of material "fire" were eliminated from the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, what might be left would quite fairly exhibit Dr. Farrar's position, though he would *call* it by some other name.

*Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

*Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With Tunes.* New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

These welcome volumes, advance copies of which have been handed us, will shortly be in the possession of our readers. As the work of an able and efficient Committee appointed by the Bishops of the Church, under authority of the General Conference, they rightfully come to us with weighty promise; and they will, we doubt not, equal the high anticipations of the Church. It was a happy thought that placed the preparation of the two books in the same hands, and another that made their publication simultaneous, thus wedding for a generation to come certain hymns with certain tunes, and contributing to the firmer welding of our people into a harmonious whole by their common hymnic liturgy, in which East, West, North, and South unite and agree.

We observe at the outset a different and more scientific classification and arrangement than even that excellent one with which we have been familiar, with its chief topics as follows: "Worship," "God," "Christ," "Holy Spirit," "The Scriptures," "The Sinner," "The Christian," "The Church," "Time and Eternity," "Miscellaneous." They have their appropriate sub-topics, with a careful and somewhat rigidly accurate distribution of the hymns under them; and the hymns are arranged in the same numerical order in both books.

Of the hymns in this collection, most will endure the test of the severest criticism. There are many noble poems that have none of the elements of the hymn, and from these the new Hymn Book is singularly free. A true hymn must be exalted in theme, elevated in expression, poetic, religious, spiritual, and full of feeling. These characteristics have ever in an eminent degree belonged to the hymnology of our Methodism. It was fortunate in having for its chief lyrist Charles Wesley, than whom the modern Church has produced no sweeter singer. His hymns, of course, form the basis of the new book, as they did of the former collections, and do of all Methodist hymn books; and it contains all the best he ever wrote. About three hundred and eighty hymns of the old book are omitted, leaving, it may be readily believed, as a residuum, most of the previous accumulations of lyric poetry that is really worth retaining. Some of it may never be sung, nor do we think that to be the true test or only use of a hymn. Read in the parlor, or in the closet, it may waft the soul as near to heaven as if it rose on the wings of song. There is a

"making melody in your hearts" that is sweeter than the vocal singer can produce.

In the three hundred and seventy new hymns, making a total of eleven hundred and seventeen, exclusive of doxologies, there is sufficient variety to satisfy all tastes and all proper demands. Out of the vast amount of material that has been produced in the last thirty years, by translations from the hymns of the Latin, Greek, and German, and by modern authors, our Committee, though embarrassed by their riches, have made an excellent selection, doubtless as good as any similar Committee could be expected to make. Certain it is that severe care, diligent labor, and conscientious effort have been employed in the work, and the result is a volume with which the Church has great reason to be more than content. We believe that the more carefully both books are examined, the greater will be the satisfaction with them.

And now it is very desirable that the Hymnal be made, so far as possible, the one book for use in all the services of the Church, the Sabbath-school, and the social meeting, as well as the sanctuary. The hymns of the Church should be reckoned among the educating agencies of her children, and their young voices should be trained for use in the congregation; and no better hymns for the prayer and class-rooms need be desired than are some hundreds of this collection. By this rule we shall fulfill the psalmist's petition, "Let all the people praise thee."

---

*The Early Years of Christianity: Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church.* By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D., author of "Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work." Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD-HOLMDEN. 12mo., pp. xxiv, 528. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

The three previous volumes of Dr. Pressensé's noble work, entitled respectively, "The Apostolic Era," "Martyrs and Apologists," "Heresy and Christian Doctrine," left a fourth topic, namely, "Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church," for the present volume. It is written in the same brilliant and vigorous style, with the same profound conviction of the need in our century of the spiritual Christianity of the apostolic age, and the same power of sharp discrimination that threw such an enchanting interest upon their pages. It is in three Books, treating, first, of "Ecclesiastical Life in the Second and Third Centuries," second, of "Private and Public Worship" in the same period, and, third, of "The Moral Life of Christians in the Third and Fourth Centuries."

The organization of the Church at the beginning of the second century is described, with the location of authority, the methods of discipline, and the mutual relation of the Churches. The rise of the hierarchy and the successive steps of the increase of episcopal authority distinctly appear, and the "crisis" at Alexandria, Rome, and Carthage, is fairly shown. But the primacy of Rome is not dreamed of at the close of the third century.

The subject of Christian worship receives admirable and instructive treatment. Its primitive simplicity and spirituality slowly give place to changes which modify its character. The religion and worship of the home, the days set apart for worship, the erection of special edifices for the purpose, the forms employed, and the prayers, hymns, and preaching, with the changes introduced in them, are the subjects of half a dozen most interesting chapters. In the third Book Christianity appears as a moral reformer, first, in the family, and then in the social life and institutions of the empire. The Pagan and Christian family are put in sharp contrast. Christianity, in its relation to the home, to slavery, to the State, to the theater, and to art, is discussed in five chapters, and the book concludes with a fine chapter on "The Christianity of the Catacombs."

In reading the volume we clearly and painfully discern the gradual transformation of the character of the Church in its progress toward the sacerdotalism and centralization which a little later became so powerful, and later still developed in the system of the Romish hierarchy. We feel assured that our readers will find a great pleasure as well as profit in its perusal; and we commend the whole series as worthy a place in every library.

---

*Homiletical Index.* A Hand-Book of Texts, Themes, and Authors, for the Use of Preachers and Bible Scholars Generally. Embracing Twenty Thousand Citations of Scripture Texts, and Discourses Founded Thereon. By J. H. PETTINGELL, A.M. With an Introduction, by GEORGE E. DAY, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale College. 8vo., pp. 316. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

This book simply grew. The Rev. Mr. Pettingell, early in his ministry, found desirable an index to whatever his library contained touching any passage of Scripture, and, as many others who have felt the same want have omitted to do, he made his notes of reference in the margin of his study-Bible. This process, continued for a series of years, furnished much of the material for the present volume. The work is unique in design and admirable in plan. Part I. is a "Textual Index," arranged in triple columns, the first presenting all the principal texts of Scripture in their

proper order, from Genesis to Revelation; the second citing the themes of discourse which eminent preachers have based upon the texts quoted, with the reference to the proper volume; and the third giving the names of the authors. The intention has been to exclude both sermons that are ephemeral in their character, and those that are not easy to be found. Some twenty thousand citations are thus made. Part II is a "Topical Index," the reverse of the former. It contains an alphabetical list of the themes and topics of the Textual Index, with the corresponding texts and names of more than a thousand authors. The excellence and helpfulness of this work to ministers and biblical students are obvious, especially as a key to their own libraries or the public theological libraries to which they may have access, enabling an easy reference, with no loss of time in the search. To a preacher it is pleasant, and often profitable, to know what various topics may be found in the same text; and he may sometimes obtain a suggestion of subjects for his own use. Four Appendixes, containing various tabular and textual arrangements, with other useful matter, give additional value to the work. The labor of its preparation has not been small, but it cannot fail to be of great convenience and utility. The Introduction, of half a dozen pages, by Dr. Day, is well worth reading and remembering, especially by every young minister who would derive the most help from the sermons of others, and at the same time maintain his own independence and self-respect.

---

*The Levitical Priests.* A Contribution to the Pentateuch. By SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, Jun., Doctor of Philosophy, Leipzig. With a Preface by Prof. FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D. 12mo. pp. xxix, 254. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. New York: Scribner, Welford, and Armstrong. 1877. Price, $2 50.

Mr. Curtiss, an American scholar resident in Germany, who has won in Europe an enviable reputation for his scientific spirit and thorough learning, ably reviews in this volume the latest phase of Pentateuch criticism, which maintains that the elevation of the sons of Aaron to the priesthood, depriving their brethren, the Levites, of the equality with them which they had previously enjoyed, was the work of Ezekiel; from which it follows that the book of Deuteronomy was written after the exile, perhaps by Hilkiah, and foisted upon Moses. Mr Curtiss takes up the arguments adduced in favor of this theory, and by a careful examination shows the existence of the distinction between priests and Levites not only in the time of Ezra, but in all periods of the Israelitish history, and that Deuteronomy, while it abridges, does

in no wise contradict the preceding legislation. He shows that while the prophets directed their shafts at the idolatrous and wicked priests, there was between them and the priesthood, as such, no antagonism. As to the authorship of Deuteronomy, Mr. Curtiss sees nothing requiring its ascription to Hilkiah, and, while not denying the critical difficulties in the way of crediting it to Moses, finds much greater ones in the way of assigning it to any other. He next turns to the theory that Ezra wrote the middle books of the Pentateuch, and arrays a conclusive argument against it, and holds that such criticism makes the Bible a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, and "no longer God's revelation to man." We have thus outlined the main features of this work, leaving it to our readers to test for themselves its excellence in thought and scholarship, and its lofty and devout spirit as well.

---

*The Religious Feeling.* A Study for Faith. By NEWMAN SMYTH. 12mo., pp. 171. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1877.

This is a small book, but we are aware of no other in the English language that so thoroughly treats its great subject. It simply assumes that we know the external world by touching it, and then puts forward as the chief religious question of our day, that relating to our capacity to come to a knowledge of God, if indeed there is a God. "Can he *touch* us, and we *feel* him?" On interrogating consciousness, the universal feeling of absolute dependence appears, which is the religious feeling in its simplest and earliest form, and is inseparable from our sense of personal existence. With this is the feeling of moral dependence, of obligation and responsibility, from which we cannot free ourselves. The derivative theory of the moral sense fails to meet all the facts. The next step in the discussion is to show that the religious feeling involves a religious perception. The transition from the feeling of dependence is found in the phenomena of wonder, fear, and awe, the beginnings of the idea of God, "the undefined revelation of the Infinite One;" and intuitions, like that of cause, the unconditioned, and the infinite, proceeding from the sense of dependence, furnish us a real knowledge. Moral reality impresses itself upon the soul, and from it springs the sense of moral obligation, which rests ultimately in God, as the one perfect Being, who is Law-giver and Judge. The concluding chapter notes, first, certain objections which may be urged against the views thus presented, and then the work which the logical understanding must perform in perfecting a correct and

full theology. The drift of many thoughtful minds is in the direction taken in this essay, which will well repay a perusal, even though the reader fail to accord with all its positions.

---

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Matthew.* By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER. Th.D., Oberconsistorialrath, Hanover. Translated from the Sixth Edition of the German by Rev. PETER CHRISTIE. The Translation Revised and Edited by FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. xliii, 451. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877. Price, $3.

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Acts of the Apostles.* By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Rev. PATON J. GLOAG, D.D. The Translation Revised and Edited by WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Vol. II., 8vo., pp. 325. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877. Price, $3.

These volumes are the ninth and tenth of the series as issued by Messrs. Clark. The translations are made by amply competent hands from the latest German editions. Dr. Meyer had just before his death, in 1873, completed the revision of Matthew in preparation for the sixth edition, and with no material change it is given to us as he left it. This first volume on Matthew extends to the end of the seventeenth chapter, with an Introduction to the Gospel of forty-four pages, and a biographical sketch of Dr. Meyer by his son. The volume on the Acts commences with the thirteenth chapter, and includes the remainder of Luke's narrative. Our high estimate of Dr. Meyer's Commentary has been heretofore so freely expressed that we need only say that the exegetical student who secures its volumes as they are issued makes most valuable additions to his apparatus for critical study of the New Testament.

---

*The People's Commentary:* Including Brief Notes on the New Testament, with Copious References to Parallel and Illustrative Scripture Passages, designed to Aid Bible Students and Common Readers to Understand the Meaning of the Inspired Word. By AMOS BINNEY, author of "The Theological Compend." With an Introduction by DANIEL STEELE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 706. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

This complete Commentary on the entire New Testament in a single duodecimo volume cannot fail to be of great convenience and utility to many persons, especially those whose means will not allow the purchase of a more extended work. Mr. Binney, its author, is one of the fathers of the New England Conference, and has been known to two generations in the Church by his admirable "Theological Compend." With little attempt at original investigation, he has gathered the results of the study of the best

commentators, and put them, with his own labor of nearly twenty years, into brief, condensed, yet very clear notes, which common readers will seldom fail to understand. The proposed limits of the work exclude most of the elaboration and explanation that are often necessary, yet no difficult passage is overlooked, and a vast amount of the best interpretation is brought within reach of the million. Many of the annotations consist simply of collections of pertinent Scripture references, making the Bible to some extent its own expositor. The full Scripture text is given at the top of the page, but in smaller type, thus allowing a much larger amount of matter to be furnished.

The Introduction, by Dr. Steele, Mr. Binney's son-in-law, shows that, in examining the entire work, both in manuscript and proof-sheets, he has freely lent it the aid of his critical skill and thorough scholarship, and no doubt the many months of severe labor thus bestowed have contributed to its greater excellence and wider acceptability. We heartily wish the book an extended circulation.

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science.* By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of M'Gill University, Montreal. 12mo., pp. 458. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

Though written upon the basis of Archaia, published in 1860, and favorably noticed in our Quarterly, this is essentially a new book from Dr. Dawson's pen. It maintains, with remarkable consistency, the same general views as the former volume, brought down to the latest conditions of science. It consists of a general and thorough comparative survey, through twelve chapters, of the Mosaic cosmogony and the creational teachings of science, with three chapters on the Antiquity of Man, and an Appendix of fifty-one pages, embracing eleven sections on as many scientific topics relating to creational history. These sections contain many valuable suggestions in regard to the present phases of science and biblical interpretation. The high position of Dr. Dawson in the scientific world will command respect for his utterances; and his equal mastery of biblical lore and physical science eminently qualifies him for the work he here undertakes.

Availing himself of the late Assyrian discoveries, Dr. Dawson assumes, as we have suggested in our Quarterly, that there is an "Abrahamic Genesis;" that is, that the cosmogonic chapters of

the Bible were truly brought by Abraham from Chaldea, being the Shemite account of creation, of which the clay tablets furnish a corrupted variation. In interpreting the cosmogony, Dr. Dawson assumes the truth of the nebular theory, and the æonic length of the Mosaic "day," and finds a coincidence between Moses and geology, which furnishes powerful proof of the inspiration of the record. His views since the first publication of Archaia have so little changed that the tabular page, in which the correspondence between the Mosaic and scientific cosmogony is synoptically exhibited in the former volume, remains unchanged in this. What we said of the former volume we reiterate in regard to this, that it furnishes on the whole the clearest harmony between the two records within our knowledge.

The divine "rest" at the close of the great week consists in the fact that, as Dr. Dawson holds, no new species has been created since that close. Varieties have emerged in great plenty and complexity, but there has been no specific origination. And hence, we may note, arises the refusal of science to acknowledge creation of species at all; no creation has taken place during the age of science, and so the human conception is puzzled to frame in thought a process which experience has never beheld. And so Mr. Huxley tells us that science can know nothing but generative production; and what science does not know, he leaves us to infer, is not to be held true.

But there are worlds of truth that science, as science, cannot know. History, and especially revealed history, science knows not; though the scientist does. Revealed history is none the less true because it is not included in the domain of science. The scientist does not reject the truth of the death of Cesar by assassination because it is not science. When, therefore, the scientist tells us that science knows no creation, our reply is: But history knows it, and knew it before science was born.

On the "unity and antiquity of man" Dr. Dawson is decisive. He holds the deluge to have covered but a part of western Asia, and that the Caspian Sea probably is the receptacle of its drainage; but the entire human race was destroyed, and all existing men are descendants of Noah, in accordance with biblical chronology. The earliest cave men of western Europe, as found by science, were, probably, antediluvian; but that race disappeared. Following such authorities as Max Müller, Latham, and Edkins, supplemented by researches of his own, he believes that the languages of the various races of the earth exhibit reliable traces of original identity.

The proofs of original linguistic unity we still imagine to be precarious. If we hold the geologic man which Professor Marsh thinks he has unearthed in America to be absolutely real, (though we wait for further evidence before doing so,) we may conclude either that the deluge destroyed not the entire human race, or, still farther back, we may, with M'Causland and Reginald Poole, accept the pre-adamic man.

And, *first*, what necessity for holding the diluvian destruction of the entire race in all parts of the earth? If we limit the terms of the sacred narrative to a specialty in regard to the surface covered, we can just as well limit the terms, no less universal, in regard to the population destroyed, to a specialty. The terms in the sacred record regarding *animals* destroyed seem equally as universal, but they are limited by Dr. Dawson to that *one center of creation*, the Edenic, the Adamic. Now, is it probable that for near sixteen hundred years the daring antediluvian men never left that center, never peopled eastern Asia, nor Africa, nor ever crossed Behring's Straits? If so, how could the African, or American, or eastern Asiatic, have been affected by the deluge? Dr. Dawson admits that the cave men of western Europe may have been antediluvians; how, then, were they drowned by a flood around the Caspian Sea and the Euphrates valley? Why not admit, if the facts are thereby easily solved, that the Chinaman, the Lapp, the American Indian, the Negro, or all, are Adamites, but not Noachidæ? All these have been, with doubtful propriety, classed as Turanian. And the admission that the Turanians are antediluvian, or rather non-diluvian, is, we think, very easy, if necessary. The flood may as reasonably be limited to that "center" in regard to people destroyed as in regard to territory.

And, *second*, why not accept, if need be, the pre-adamic man? If Dr. Dawson admits an Adamic center of creation, why not admit, if pressed, other centers of human origin? The record does not seem to deny other centers in narrating the history of this center. The atonement, as all evangelical theology admits, has a retrospective power. It provides, as St. Paul says, "remission for the sins that are past;" that is, for those who lived and sinned before Christ died; and who received "remission" from God in anticipation of the atonement. It was thus that Abraham was justified by faith, through the Christ that had not yet made the expiation. The atonement thus may throw responsibility and propitiation for sin over all past time, all terrene sections, and all human races. So, too, the sin of Adam may

bring all past misdoings of earlier races under the category of sin and condemnation; that is, under the inauguration of a system of retribution which otherwise would not have taken existence. Some theologians have held that the atonement throws its sublime influence over other worlds than ours; why not, then, over earlier human races? Here, as often elsewhere, science, that seemed to threaten theology, does but open before it broader fields and sublimer elevations. It contradicts our narrow interpretations, and reads into the text worlds of new meaning. With this provisional view we have not the slightest misgiving as to the effect of the demonstration of the pre-adamic man upon our own theology.

Dr. Dawson shows no sign of yielding to the latest logic of Darwinism. Before the divine "rest" species were created. And the superstitious horror expressed by many scientists at what they effeminately style "*special* creation" he soothes by telling them that creation is by law; that is, it accords with the law of divine wisdom, which acts with a free uniformity in similar conditions. It is simply the continued action of that same orderly power which originated existence at first. The whole drift of geological evidence, as pictured on the ancient strata, declares that species have ever sprung, by divine law, power, and act, into sudden and complete existence. All this is not contravened by the fact that as viewed by the investigation the lines of descending species become wonderfully and even inextricably entangled. And at this point we may suggest that Darwinists cover all difficulties by impeaching the sufficiency of the geological record; just as if they were sure that the complete record would prove genetic evolution. How do they know that the complete record, perfectly understood, would not, after all, show that, while varieties were far more numerous than we suspected, yet true species have nevertheless suddenly originated, and drawn their long and spreading lines through the ages.

On this whole subject we offer the following suggestions:—

1. To an observant human spectator, a positive creation of a new form would appear to be what is at the present day called, not very properly, "spontaneous generation." To his bodily eye the divine Creator would be invisible. And could he see the particles and parts so take their place as to form a symmetrical being of full size, the whole process would appear to be a spontaneity. In this sense "spontaneous generation," that is, *creation*, we may believe to be a truth.

2. But experimentists will never find it in the direction of animalcular spontaneous production. Neither the condition of such spontaneity, nor the result, can be effected by human agency. Biblically, we may believe that, even by divine power, such creative spontaneity or creation was limited within the period of the creative week, and was then exerted in producing large and complete as well as minute forms. It could take place only in those conditions and at those stages of existence required by the divine plan; which is no other than the plan of nature; for the plan and laws of nature are only the permanent ordering and proceeding of the divine volitions. At the proper stage of progression the divine will works under guise of the formative energy, or, as Cudworth more beautifully styled it, "the plastic power." This plastic power may construct an entirely new form; or it may complete, with new addition, an old form; or it may, by successive originating plasms, carry on a series of perfecting forms through successive epochs. This plastic power may work through ordinary generation to vary or perfect an existing form or species, or may originate at successive epochs. The phenomena of geology indicate that new species have thus suddenly come into existence.

3. The case of the horse was adduced by Professor Huxley, to prove that *all* animal forms and species are produced by generative development. He did make probable that the equine plan is geologically very ancient, and that it has gone through a series of such epochal perfectings. Whether these epochal perfectings were by generative modifications or creative plasms, he did not show. And even assuming that the equine plan was perfected through successive generations, he proved nothing beyond the equine form. He did not thereby prove that man became man by generation from a lower species.

4. But it may be said science knows new forms to originate by generation, but knows no creation. To which we reply: 1, That science knows no creation, because creation ceased before science began; and, 2, That science cannot disprove the statement by revelation that creations have taken place, and we have a right to trust revelation until science disproves it. The ignorance of science cannot refute a revealed fact.

5. In our Quarterly for October, 1877, page 750, we gave Dr. Winchell's brief notes of his reasons for his present conviction, that genetic evolution should be accepted. Without impeaching his science or his orthodoxy, we must say that the reasons do not

convey full conviction to our own mind. His reasons may be summarized as one. The latest researches show that a large proportion of animals heretofore recognized as species are found to be only varieties. In other words, investigation and exploration, as they progress, reveal not only vast numbers of animals hitherto unknown, but a vast number of relations between animals hitherto unsuspected. So we should expect. Let our noble army of scientists prosecute their researches and find next, if they can, the extent and limit of the animal forms, and also the extent and limit of the relations between them. Let them not in hasty zeal, or in hasty fright, jump to unascertained conclusions, and cry out that there are no limits. Genetic relations may, perhaps, be immensely numerous and complicated, and yet a permanent number of real creations of species still remain. If Dr. Dawson is right in maintaining, down to the year 1877, that the whole drift of geology affirms sudden appearance of species during the creative week, there is a solid standing ground, we imagine, against the illimitability of genetic relations.

---

*The Ancient Life-History of the Earth.* A Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palæontological Science. By H. ALLEYNE NICHOLSON, M.D., D. Sc., F.R.S.E., F.L.S., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews. 12mo., pp. xviii, 407. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

In a former work Professor Nicholson considered the facts of Palæontology on its biological side, reserving for the present volume the historical side of the science, and its relations with geology. The work is in two parts, the first being devoted to general principles, and the second taking up the several formations separately and in order, beginning with the Laurentian rocks as the base of the entire stratified series, and considering the relation of each formation to the others, its mode of origin, and its characteristic life-forms, with their chronological succession. Though the work is primarily intended for students, constant reference has been had in its preparation to the wants of the general reader. The author is a thorough master of his subject, and, whether discussing principles, or describing rocks and fossils, writes in a clear and animated style, and with great candor and freedom from dogmatism in the conclusions which he deduces from his facts.

It is clearly ascertained that there has been a succession of life upon the earth in genera, species, sub-kingdoms, and classes, and in the main they succeed one another in time in the relative order

of their zoological rank, the lower groups appearing first, and the higher groups last. All this seems to point to some law of progression, yet Professor Nicholson thinks "we certainly are not yet in a position to formulate this law, or to indicate the precise manner in which it has operated." He discerns some orderly law of modification and evolution; yet it is "certain that there has always been some other deeper and higher law at work," for no theory of evolution can explain "the constant introduction throughout geological time of new forms of life, which do not appear to have been preceded by pre-existent allied types," like the Graptolites and Trilobites. This is as refreshing as it is modest.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence in that Island. By General Louis Palma Di Cesnola, Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Turin, etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., pp. xix, 456. New York: Harper and Brothers.

The author of this book, an Italian, as his name shows, did the United States some service during the late civil war, and at its close was appointed by President Lincoln, only a few days before his assassination, American Consul at Cyprus. On Christmas day, 1865, he reached the island. As the vessel slowly approached the land, he surveyed the forlorn-looking town of Larnaca, and its unattractive surroundings, and his first thought was to remain on board ship and resign his office. The steamer anchored a mile from the shore, and a small boat from the town brought a score of natives to greet the new consul, who announced themselves as "the staff of the American Consulate." The General and his wife committed themselves to the little craft, and when they reached the beach with no signs of a wharf, the boat stuck in the sand some distance from the dry land, and the representative of the great American Republic was carried ashore on the shoulders of one of the boatmen. But his American wife beheld this proceeding with consternation and horror, and utterly refused to land on Cyprus, or any other island in all the seas, by such a mode of transportation. At last every body else got into the water, and fairly forced the boat over the sand, till the lady was able to step ashore with perfect propriety.

In this ludicrous way the Consul began his acquaintance with his field of official labor, where he was destined to live, and quarrel

with the Turks, and explore old burial-places and ruins, for ten long years. Larnaca occupies the site of ancient Citium; and a mound still exists, which seems to have been the foundation of a temple. Fragments of pottery and antique statuary had been found buried in the earth; and here, the year after his arrival, General Cesnola began to dig in a casual way, little dreaming whereunto his explorations would grow. His hope, as well as his curiosity, was stimulated by the little successes which these first experiments achieved; and soon he was ready to risk all his means, and spend all his time not occupied in the duties of his consulate, in researches which ultimately reached every promising spot in the whole island.

As interesting discoveries began to be made and antique objects of value were dug up, the cupidity of the Turks became excited, and various obstacles were thrown in his way, taxing the firmness and ingenuity, and sometimes rousing the wrath, of the explorer. The English and the French Consuls caught the mania for digging, and were rewarded with some success. Their operations were, however, conducted on a small scale compared with those of Cesnola. He opened thousands of old tombs, Assyrian, Phœnician, Egyptian, and Greek, and discovered immense numbers of interesting objects—statues, vases, coins, gold ornaments, gems, works in alabaster, ivory, silver, bronze and terra-cotta, the relics of various nations, and the highest achievements of their arts, gathered up out of the dust of twenty-five centuries. One single shipment comprised three hundred and sixty cases.

The story of this shipment curiously illustrates the Turkish manner of doing business. General Cesnola had been careful to obtain firmans from the authorities, granting him permission to make his explorations. But when he had made his wonderful discoveries, and gathered his ancient treasures, he was gravely informed that the Government had granted him the privilege of excavating here and there, but had not authorized him to remove from the island any of the objects discovered. As he had borne the entire expense of the work, he regarded as his own the articles which he had found, and he stoutly declared his intention of shipping them for New York. Soon a firman arrived, forbidding the American Consul to take away the relics; and Cesnola sank for a small space into wrathful despair. But one of the natives of his "staff" came to the rescue, reminding him that he, the General, was also Russian Consul; and that, while the firman was sufficiently explicit in regard to the representative of the United

States, it laid no restrictions upon the representative of Russia. The idea was acted upon instantly; the three hundred and sixty cases were hurried on board the vessel waiting for them, and, before the local officials could get a new firman including the Russian Consul, the ship sailed.

The work is well written, beautifully printed, and elegantly illustrated. An introductory chapter gives a brief history of the island, and an Appendix, from the pen of C. W. King, adds ninety pages of antiquarian lore in regard to the gems, inscriptions, and other curious articles discovered.

---

*History of the English People.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M. A. In four volumes. Vol. I—Early England, 449–1071. England Under Foreign Kings, 1071–1204. The Charter, 1204–1291. The Parliament, 1307–1461. With eight maps. 8vo, pp. xii, 576. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Mr. Green's "Short History of the English People," published some four years since, was in every respect so excellent that it not only received wide attention, but won an unusual acceptance among all classes of readers. Its brilliant pages held the student a willing captive, its vivid and varying pictures of English society gave to history an unwonted air of reality, and its evident scholarship was recognized by the learned; while its purpose of a history of the English People, rather than of English kings and conquests, was different from any thing previously attempted, and specially attractive to those who would learn the progress of England by the help of the missionary, the scholar, the printer, and the merchant, to her present constitutional, intellectual, and social condition.

We are familiar with abridgments; but it is seldom that an author pursues the method, as has Mr. Green, of first preparing his compendium, and afterward basing upon it the larger work. In comparing the two, we find some re-arrangements and changes which are for the better. Mr. Green has not hesitated to use the exact language of the "Short History" where, in either accuracy or fullness, it expresses what he would say, but further and broader study and research have made him master of much additional material, of which we have the full benefit. The chapters in Book I., on "Early England," are substantially unchanged, and for the reason, doubtless, that the whole story was already substantially told. English history properly begins with the invasion of Britain in 449 by Hengest and Horsa, for then began the history of Englishmen in that country. Mr. Green shows us their

institutions as they were before the invasion, with their town-moot, hundred-moot, and folk-moot, which were really the foundation of the English domestic, social, and political life of to-day. These they brought with them and planted in their new home, driving out the Briton before them more sweepingly than the Hebrews drove the nations from Canaan. So "a Teutonic society was settled on the wreck of Rome. Not a Briton remained as subject or slave on English ground." Paganism displaced Christianity. Our author dwells not long on the political changes of the times, but he lingers on Augustine and Bede, the conquests of the Cross, and the advance of learning, which have contributed so largely to the molding of English society.

The broader plan of the author leads to a fuller treatment the farther he advances in the volume; but he is ever true to his single purpose of presenting the events of social life out of which has grown the England of to-day. If the work is completed in accordance with the promise of this first volume, of which we make no question, it must take rank with the noblest historical productions of the century. Its style is remarkably clear, vigorous, and fresh, while in power of description Mr. Green is scarcely excelled by Macaulay, Motley, or Stevens. Eight maps are inserted in the volume, showing the political divisions of the country at as many different periods, the usefulness of which is readily apparent.

---

*A History of England in the Eighteenth Century.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. Vols. I, II. 8vo., pp. xix, 626; xvi, 699. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

The period covered by these volumes is a brief one, but it furnishes ample themes for the historian who will dwell less on military events and party incidents than on those facts and institutions which enter deeply into the national life, and become permanent national forces. The author accordingly deals with the great questions and subjects of the century, such as the growth or decline of the different orders of society, of the important interests of the country, agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial, the social, educational and religious movements of the time, and the relations of England to her dependencies and to other nations. The field is a broad one, but it is surveyed with the eye of a master who knows how to bring facts widely scattered in time or place to a single focus. Extensive research, careful collation, and rare philosophic insight are constantly apparent in these

pages, while the easy style of narrative employed is seldom surpassed by a historian.

The author's vision is clear, and his judgments sharp and incisive. The final chapter of a hundred and thirty pages, entitled, "The Religious Revival," is devoted chiefly to the rise and growth of Methodism. As a movement powerfully affecting the condition and welfare of the country, the author gives it the full meed of praise which is now conceded it by all; yet Methodists will not generally assent to some of his sharp delineations of Wesley's personal character. Nevertheless, they, and all readers as well, will find the chapter one of very great interest and power. We presume additional volumes may be expected.

---

*The History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida, from* 1785 *to* 1865. By GEO. G. SMITH, Jun., of North Georgia Conference. 12mo., pp. 530. Macon: John W. Burke & Co. 1877.

Though this volume is written chiefly for the remote South, all Methodist Episcopalians have an interest in the achievements narrated, at least for the first sixty years, for during that period we were one body. The historic names are familiar to us all, and the story of their toils, struggles, and successes is so admirably told that it should receive a wide acceptance. It is in the form of annals, with full personal sketches of men noted in their day, and now gone to their reward. The minuteness of detail has its local importance, but the profuseness of incident cannot fail to interest a wider circle. We note a few slight errors, such as locating Wesleyan University in Vermont, and crediting Dr. Fisk to the same State at his election to the Episcopacy, but we make no question of Mr. Smith's general accuracy. A mistake of more importance is in the following sentence, in the account of the events of 1844: "The famous Committee of Nine, to whom the declaration of the Southern delegates was referred, reported what is known as the Plan of Separation, which provides for the establishment of another General Conference, in case it became evident that such a result was necessary." Mr. Smith, of course, believes this statement beyond question, but if he will examine the document itself, he will find that it simply "provides" for the *action of the Methodist Episcopal Church alone*, "in case" the South should organize a separate Church. As Judah and Ephraim are not going to vex one another any more, it is about time for us all to get this little historical point correct. Yet, the treatment of those times is moderate, candid, and in excellent spirit.

## *Periodicals.*

*The Florida New Yorker.* J. B. OLIVER, Editor. Devoted to the Good Cause of Southern Emigration. Vol. II. Folio, pp. 16 per number. New York: 34 Park Row. 1878.

*The Southern Herald.* Folio, 8 pp. per number. New York, Columbia and Gafney City, S. C.

We place at the head of this notice two specimens of a class of papers, edited by Southerners, and devoted to the cause of emigration southward. They are a very marked and auspicious sign of our times. They are among the indications of a new era of union, peace, and prosperity in our national future. We speak not now of political indications, which may be adverse enough, but of those better tendencies springing from industrial and commercial sources.

The auspiciousness of this era arises largely from a great revolution not only in the institutions, but in the feelings, policy, and very character of our Southern brethren. The period is not very long past when to have published the following sentiment, which we quote from the last-mentioned paper, would have entitled the writer in the South to the epithet of incendiary, and to at least a banishment by Judge Lynch: "*Had it not been for the unfortunate institution of slavery,* the South would not only have been the location of great cities and vast wealth, but it would have been the resort of the youths of the country to obtain a finished education." This feeling that slavery was an incubus upon the enterprise and prosperity of the country reaches every class of community. The changes for the better that have already taken place by the abandonment of the old Chinese exclusiveness imposed by the slave-holding oligarchy, and by the incoming of tourists, visitors, and immigrants, have already opened a new era which is palpable to the humblest intellect. As we were, three years ago, being driven in a hack by a "cracker" charioteer through a central section of Florida, we were pointed by him to a young orange grove near a house by the road-side, with the remark: "That man, before the war, cut down an old wild orange grove to plant corn in its place; now he has started another grove." "Why in the world did he cut down his old grove?" we inquired. "O, they didn't know nothing about transportation in them days," replied Cracker, plainly conscious of a new epoch. The other day we said to the southern-born superintendent of a large orange grove on the St. John's, now owned by

a non-resident New Englander, "We have come down now, not to light you, but to help you build up Florida." "Yes," said he, "and if you hadn't come, I don't know how Florida would have ever gotten up." The various cities and sections are now courting northern visitors and emigrants. Jacksonville has just voted a quarter of a million dollars toward beautifying and purifying her domains. Thomasville, Georgia, has "gone crazy" over her own beauties, has made herself more beautiful, has built a splendid hotel after northern fashion, and claims, in a wide-spread pamphlet, that she is the Mecca for the northern pilgrims. Pensacola this year flashes out in an elegant circular as "a new light upon Florida." It is clear that in this race Florida, as she was earliest, still is, and must be, uppermost. Her unalienable advantage is her essentially insular position. She takes the ocean breezes from both sides, as no more northerly section can. We speak of ocean on both sides, for really the Gulf is so much ocean cut off by the long and bold projection of the Florida peninsula. And then the magnificent St. John's comes down like another Nile from the southern highlands, ready to bring the future semi-tropical productions of that virgin region. Far in that high south the Everglades are a vast inland sea, from one to six feet deep, studded with a myriad of islets, the home of a rich, luxuriant life, both vegetable and animal. It is higher than the ocean surface, and an easy drainage would, it is said, transform it into one of the richest spots upon our globe. But our main purpose is to illustrate how this abandonment of the old exclusiveness is creating a new, fraternal feeling in the common non-political mind of North and South. King Cotton is dethroned and Judge Lynch is dead; and the patriotic Unionist may rejoice that North and South are ceasing to be on terms of hate as truly as East and West.

A more humane policy in regard to the negro race is, we trust, gaining ascendency. This reaction from that era when to educate a negro was a penal offense, is rapid and hopeful. It was noted in our last Quarterly that the Legislature of Georgia has donated $8,000 to a college for colored students in Atlanta. The Legislature of South Carolina has similarly endowed our college, under Dr. Cooke, in Orangeburgh. The last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as we noted at the time, uttered not a syllable in behalf of negro education; but, from the noble sentiments of Dr. Summers, uttered in a late Nashville Advocate, we cheerfully anticipate that their next session, soon to be held, will take decisive action upon the right ground.

And when that is done, what ground of difference remains between the two Churches?

The wealth and prosperity of the South would conduce to the perpetuity of our nationality. No wise man wishes to attach her to the Union by making her an Ireland. Immigration, internal commerce, the north and south railroads, are great obliterators of sectional lines. Wealth and peaceful prosperity are the opponents of war. The reason why our Northern States were so reluctant to enter into the late war, and were so unprepared for it when it came, was, that they dreaded the loss of wealth and prosperity which war entailed. Our national debt is a reminder how wise was that dread. The South imagined she had little to lose, and that that little would be rather increased by the spoils of the near future victory. The new era is bringing a new set of thoughts, ambitions, and projects. There are visions of industrial enterprise, flourishing agriculture, productive manufacture, railroads, colleges and universities, populous towns and cities. All these enterprises speak of peace. They demand an increase of population, and inspire an open heart and hand to all other parts of our country and of the world. They may bring about a new harmony between the sections, which we earnestly trust that the politicians, secular and ecclesiastical, cannot destroy.

In furtherance of this restoration of our true and permanent nationality, nothing could be more wise and patriotic than the entire policy of President Hayes. The three great objects at which he aims are, the blending the hearts of the two sections into a firm national unity, the securing an honest repudiation of financial repudiation, and the attaining a higher and purer style of politics. These aims are right. The people of all sections, whatever the politicians may do, should rally to his support. Hampered and harrassed as he has been by factionists, and deserted by men who should have cheered and sustained him in his career, earnestly do we hope and pray that he will firmly maintain his fidelity to the righteous cause. For it is only by the success of that cause, by himself or his successors, that our country can be pure, peaceful, and prosperous.

---

*The Christian Recorder.* Philadelphia: B. T. TANNER, D.D., Editor.

This is the official organ of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and is conducted with eminent ability and success. It is the leading paper of the colored people in America. There are a number

of lesser lights; and when we consider that these periodicals have all taken existence during the brief period since the death of slavery and the resurrection into freedom, they are an auspicious omen for the race. Not long since the editor complained that every editor of the Church South refused to exchange with him. Such a refusal on their part is certainly injudicious, for some of them, at least, would, in point of ability and courtesy, be the gainers in the swap.

We consider the men of the "Recorder" to be engaged in a very important work of philanthropy. They are leading the way in the assertion for the colored race of the ability for a high civilization. It cannot be denied, it cannot be too explicitly made known, that the negro is on trial. Frederick Douglass, a few months since, told his people that twenty years would settle their case. If they were not by that time on the right level, they were a doomed race. Nor are the omens all propitious. Neither Liberia nor the West Indies shows a very encouraging upward tendency. Here in the North we have, in past years, known two instances in which the negroes withdrew into a separate community, formed in time a sort of horde, rejected the offer of school and Church, sunk, not into savageism, but into animalism, and gradually disintegrated and disappeared. It is evident that all the philanthropy, both of the whites and the cultured blacks, should be called into exertion to prove that such regress is not the inherent tendency of the race. If such exertion fail, then the inference would be solemnly drawn that "the survival of the fittest" is a law for human as well as for other races. From anti-Christian scientism the dogma would pass into the pale of Christian thinkers, that the disappearance of all other races before one supreme race is the law of nature under Providence, and its completion only a question of time. Civilization offers the alternative of acceptance or destruction. "The nation that will not serve Thee shall perish." The millennium would be the sole survivorship of the race that accepts its conditions.

But the pressures under which our negroes live entitle them to a longer period than twenty years' probation. Great as has been the improvement of the spirit of the Southern white population toward the colored race, the weight of oppression, we have reason to believe, is yet very depressing. Many who have a just and even benevolent side in every other direction have, almost unconsciously, only a hard side toward the negro. He is "only a nigger;" and the fair dealing due to others in trade, in wages, in

exact payments, in respect for rights and feelings, is unconceded to him. He has no redress from the Courts; for his oppressors would very likely be his judges and jurors. This feeling, North and South, can be revolutionized most effectively by a change wrought in the negro himself, which can come from only the Church, the school, and the newspaper.

---

*El Evangelista, Órgano de la Verdad Evangélica en el Rio de La Plata.* Montevideo.

We have received the first five numbers of the religious weekly published by our mission at Montevideo, and edited by the Rev. Thomas B. Wood. It is a handsomely printed royal octavo, folded and stitched in a tasteful cover. It is greatly to be regretted that under the pressure of the times our Missionary Board has been unable to assist in this enterprise, and that our missionaries in that field are compelled to either take it upon their own shoulders, or do without its aid. It deserves to win; and we are sure that this beginning of evangelical publications in that quarter of the globe, albeit without help, carries with it the promise of great results. It is a live sheet, practical, evangelical, earnest, adapted to immediate wants, and devoted to spiritual Christianity, and cannot fail to do great good. We trust the day may be not far distant when the Church will be able to supply all needed reinforcements of both money and men in our South American work, and that meanwhile this brave little venture may gloriously and usefully live.

---

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Prometheus, Dionysos, Sokrates, Christos;* von Heinrich Karl Hugo Delff. Gotha: F. A. Perthes.

A very Teutonic book! Herr Delff is hard to classify. Not a materialist; he scorns materialism. "It has been from of old the pet occupation of materialism to quibble all validity out of every thing humane, or ideal, or spiritual. Whatever new disguise it may put on, it is still the same old enemy that was long since sentenced to death and executed. It was sentenced when old Kronos was hurled into Tartaros, when Prometheus was riveted to the rocks. The conscience of humanity has long since cursed and rejected it, once and for all." Nor is the author a Christian in the churchly sense; and yet no biblical dogmatist can set higher value upon Christianity. "Christianity is the fulfillment and the end

of all our hopes. Higher and better than it, there is nothing. It is the definitive goal of the long series of partial religions that preceded it. It is the absolute *Truth.* However much contemporary thought may get bewildered in the mire of sensism, the Christian idea, the Christian spirit, cannot vanish from the horizon of humanity. *It* stands forever with flaming sword at the gates of conscience. Let no one think that the essence of Christianity can be reduced to a few rationalistic abstractions. When the roots are cut off, how can the tree retain its life? No, no! Those who are hostile to Christianity as a whole are hostile to every thing that is of worth anywhere: they are the enemies of true culture, enemies of the State, enemies of society, enemies of all high endeavor, enemies of the human race." The work of Dr. Delff is a philosophy of religion. It merits a place by the side of many other contemporary works on the subject. It is peculiar in being so thoroughly concrete. It seizes directly upon the crude pre-Christian religions, and endeavors to show how they came to *be*, how they came to decay, how they successively gave place to higher forms, until the "fullness of time" came for the absolute incarnation of the truth in Christ. *Prometheus* represented the lowest form of the religious idea. It is the religion of utility. Its highest product is civilization. It was incarnated in the prosy State of China. *Dionysos* is traced through all the Oriental mythologies. He is the symbol of something higher than utility. He is the wine god, the god of enthusiasm and poesy. Even the enthusiasm of delirium is better than the dead prosiness of mere utility. *Sokrates* is a protest against mere instinct-religions, and an appeal to the world of ideas. His death was a necessity. Either *he* had to be abolished, or the traditional religions had to go down. He groped toward the absolute religion, but he did not fully find it. Truth, as reflected through him, was only Greek truth. It was beclouded by many onesidednesses. It was partial, not universalistic, not cosmopolitan. But *Christos* is absolutely cosmopolitan. He is the *finale.* All other religions were but poor broken rays from the sun; Christ is the sun itself, without shadow of intervening veil. Christ is not the ideal of any national consciousness. Greek gods were created by Greek bards. Christ did not spring out of the Jewish consciousness. This consciousness was antagonistic to him; it repeatedly fell away from him; it rejected and crucified him. But Christ engrafted himself *into* this consciousness. He was the incarnation of the absolute ideal into humanity. He was the son of *Man.*

Christ placed the Jehovah Elohim of the Jews in a new light. He clothed him in a halo of gentleness and love. As manifested in Christ, God is no longer the slave of technical formalities, no longer the unapproachable, consuming flame of unbending justice, demanding unconditionally the death of the sinner. This awful God, Jesus, by his atoning death, metamorphosed into a pitying Father. Jesus is the daysman, receiving into his own heart the darts of absolute justice.

The nearest classification of the author is as an idealist. "The conscience of humanity pronounces idealism the truth, and naturalism a sham. The culture of humanity has long since relegated naturalism into the dead past. Any attempt at reviving it is but the galvanizing of a mummy. Its revival would be the wreck of the progress of millenniads. But it cannot be revived. The conscience of the race calls for idealism. God and nature are absolute antitheses. Monism is a superseded stand-point; it is essentially hostile to all religion, and to all high culture."

We thank Dr. Delff for his instructive guidance through the ancient mythologies. We only regret that when he uses such expressions as "Christianity is *the* truth," "Christ is Jehovah incarnate," he does not mean what the Church means.

---

*Frauenthätigkeit und Christenthum: Beitrag zur Verständigung über eine Zeitfrage.* (The Relation of Woman to Christian Work.) Von L. O. Vogt. Berlin: Prochnow, Jun.

The nine chapters of this book run thus: I. The Social Emancipation wrought by Christianity; II. The Natural Difference of the Sexes; III. The Position of Woman in Non-Christian Nations; IV. The Relation of the Sexes to each Other, according to the New Testament; V. The Influence which Christianity has had on the Position of Woman; VI. The Circumstances which are at present leading to the Enlargement of the Sphere of Female Activity; VII. The Principles which, according to Christianity, must Determine the Position of Woman; VIII. The Relation of Woman to Civil Life, to Science, and to the Church.

The general position of the author is conservative, if not reactionary. But in the course of his work he brings the champions of "women's rights" into such full discussion with the "fogies," their opponents, as to render his book of high interest to the leaders of either party. Some of the cited and discussed authors are: Riehl, *Die Familie*, Stuttgart; Heisterbergk, *Wort an Frauen über die Frau*, Gotha; Hoffmann, *Der Zustand des*

*weiblichen Geschlechts im Morgenlande;* Lewald, *Für und wider die Frauen*, Berlin; Dohm, *Die wissenschaftliche Emancipation der Frau;* Pinoff, *Reform der weiblichen Erziehung*, Breslau; Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen im Mittelalter*, Vienna; also many French and English authors.

The conclusions reached by the author are, that a true and better position for the woman of the future will, after all, result from the present earnest discussion of the whole subject; but he sees in the general spirit of the champions of emancipation a great danger to the integrity of the family, at least for the present generation. And he exclaims, with real anxiety, "Surely no patriot or Christian could, in his right mind, wish to weaken in the least the already relaxed integrity and unity of the German family!"

---

*Saint Anselme au Bec*, (The Character of St. Anselm.) Par M. RAGEY. Paris: G. Tegui.

St. Anselm belongs to the whole Church Catholic, Protestant as well as Roman. Though chiefly known as a profound theologian, and especially as the originator of a very influential theory of the atonement, his personal character is no less interesting and eminent for all good qualities than are his speculations. The book before us is a graphic sketch of St. Anselm as a man, a Christian, and a guide of souls in the way of life. Heroic must be any man who can stamp his impress upon the world as did St. Anselm in the eleventh century. Such men rule by divine right—in virtue of what they make of themselves by fidelity to conscience and to God. It is well for the Protestant of to-day occasionally to go back on the path of history, and form fresh acquaintance with the men of God who lightened up the night of the dismal past. It intensifies our feeling of human brotherhood. It gives us a salutary consciousness of our communion with the Church general in all times and nations, and sects. The chain of saints is a chain which stretches along *all* the ages. There have been no great blanks in it. The ancient Church and the patristic Church had their "saints." So has the modern Church. And the galaxy of the Middle Ages stands between and fills up the chasm. The book of Professor Ragey is written with a careful Christian hand.

---

*Das Vaterunser.* Von S. F. EVERTSBUSCH, HEYDER, und ZIMMER. Frankfurt-au-Main.

An excellent book, of 330 pages, on the Lord's Prayer. The author classifies the prayer thus: The invocation, the *seven* peti-

tions, and the conclusion. His work is a practical treatise on the whole round of the Christian life. It is a needed work. Query, Do not we Methodists make too little of the Lord's Prayer? Do not a large majority of our preachers positively disregard the "Discipline" by neglecting to conclude the opening prayer of both morning and evening service with the Lord's Prayer? What is the explanation of this? Have we not fallen into such a hortatory and rhetorical style of praying as to find it embarrassing to step down into the childlike simplicity of the words of Christ? Or, what is the real reason? The matter is, at least, worthy of attention.

---

*Intempérance et Misère.* Par J. LEFORT. Paris: Guillaumin et Cie.

This book comes from the legal profession, and is deserving of attention. It has been crowned by the "Academy of Moral and Political Sciences," and has the good-will of the best men of France. Its three parts are: 1. Intemperance, its Nature, History, Geographical Distribution, and Occasions; 2. Intemperance and Pauperism; 3. Means of Repression, Penal and Fiscal Laws, Temperance Societies, etc. The chapter on the history of intemperance in the past is very instructive; so, also, that on the occasions of the vice. The author, with all his moral and religious earnestness against the enormous evil, lingers behind the American stand-point. He even doubts whether the total abandonment of wine in Northern France would be hygienic wisdom. But the actual evils of excess he combats and portrays as earnestly as could possibly be desired. In the practical questions here discussed, public sentiment is nowhere so far advanced as in our own United States.

---

*Der Werth des Lebens,* (The Value of Life.) Von DR. E. DÜHRING. Leipzig: Roisland.

Dr. Dühring is the blind philosopher of Berlin. He writes in genial style, and spices most of his pages with wit and irony. He greatly admires Schopenhauer, but as earnestly antagonizes his philosophy. Life is not a pessimistic delusion, fit only to be thrust back into night; but the good of existence far outweighs the evil. Dühring looks hopefully to the future, both of philosophy and of society.

---

*Die Forschung Nach der Materie,* (Search after Matter.) Von J. HUBER. München: T. Ackermann.

What is matter? Professor Huber is not a materialist. Mind is anterior to matter, and above it. Matter cannot be made to ex-

plain the phenomena of mind. To endow material atoms (and who knows what a material atom is?) with life and power, is only to dodge the question. Animated atoms are simply atoms *plus* life. A materialist who assumes animated atoms, unwittingly gives up his materialistic foundation. Professor Huber's book ably refutes the mechanical theory of the universe.

---

*Theorie und Erfahrung,* (Theory and Experience,) von DR. P. KRAMER. Halle: L. Nebert.

A candid discussion of Darwinism, with anti-Darwinian conclusions. Darwinism rests upon a too narrow basis. The facts or principles which it admits are inadequate for the results which it infers.

---

## *Miscellaneous.*

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum ad Brutum Libri Quinque.* Recognovit REINHOLDUS KLOTZ. Novi Eboraci: Apud Harperos Fratres. MDCCCLXXVIII.

*A Manual of the Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. 12mo., pp. 596. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

Seven years since, Professor Huxley published his "Manual of the Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals," in half performance of a purpose formed twenty-two years ago, and with this volume he gives us the other half. It is devoted to the morphology of the Invertebrates, with only incidental reference to their physiology and distribution, and with none to their ætiology, save in half a dozen pages of the Introduction.

*Why a Catholic in the Nineteenth Century?* By WILLIAM GILES DIX. 16mo., pp. 101. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1878.

Mr. Dix, a pervert to Romanism, means *Roman* Catholic. He forgets many things, and seems to suppose the world to have forgotten them too, such as the history of the Middle Ages, and of the last twenty years as well, the Syllabus of 1864, and the universal war of Rome with religious liberty.

*A History of Methodism, for Our Young People.* By WILLIAM W. BENNETT, D.D. 16mo., pp. 273. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

An attractive sketch of Mr. Wesley and of the rise and growth of Methodism to the time of his death, with a summary of subsequent progress in the final chapter. Our young people should have it.

*Bessie, the Cash Girl.* By Mrs. MARY D. BRINE. Two Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 195. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1878.

A capital little book for the juveniles.

*Through a Needle's Eye.* By HESBA STRATTON, author of "Bede's Charity," "The King's Servants," "Brought Home," etc. 16mo., pp. 433. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company. 1878.

Decidedly one of the better class of works of fiction.

*The Old Looking-Glass;* or, Mrs. Dorothy Cope's Recollections. By MARIA LOUISA CHARLESWORTH, author of "Ministering Children," etc. 16mo., pp. 268. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

*School History of Rome from the Foundation of the City to the Extinction of the Empire of the West.* Abridged from Dean Merivale's General History of Rome, with the Sanction of the Author. By C. PULLER, M.A., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With Thirteen Maps. 16mo., pp. xxiv, 390. New York: Harper & Brothers.

*Harper's Half-Hour Series.* 32mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.
John Milton.—Lord Byron. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 139.
My Lady's Money. By WILKIE COLLINS. Pp. 216.
Poor Zeph! By F. W. ROBINSON. Pp. 125.
The Earl of Chatham. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 204.
William Pitt. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 102.
John Hampden.—Lord Burleigh. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 133.
Field-Marshal Count Moltke's Letters from Russia. Translated from the German by GRACE BIGELOW. Pp. 181.
The Bride of Landeck. By G. P. R. JAMES. Pp. 102.
Brother Jacob.—The Lifted Veil. By GEORGE ELIOT. Pp. 169.
The Tender Recollections of Irene Macgillicuddy. Pp. 94.
A Shadow on the Threshold. By MARY CECIL HAY. Pp. 128.
Frederic the Great. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 125.

*All Saints' Day and Other Sermons.* By Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY, M.A., Late Rector of Eversley and Canon of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. W. Harrison, M.A. 12mo., pp. 410. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1878.

*History of Opinions on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution.* By EDWARD BEECHER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 334. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

*Epochs of Modern History.* The Beginning of the Middle Ages. By R. W. CHURCH, Dean of St. Paul's. With Three Maps. 16mo., pp. xxii, 226. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

*State Regulation of Vice.* Regulation Efforts in America. The Geneva Congress. By AARON M. POWELL. 16mo., pp. 127. New York: Wood & Holbrook. 1878.

*Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year* 1877. 8vo., pp. 396. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

*A Jewel of a Girl.* A Novel. By the Author of "Queenie," etc. 8vo., pp. 137. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Two Tales of Married Life.* Hard to Bear. By GEORGIANA M. CRAIK. A True Man. By M. C. STIRLING. 8vo., pp. 118. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Young Musgrave.* A Novel. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. 8vo., pp. 144. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Green Pastures and Piccadilly.* A Novel. By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "A Princess of Thule," etc., in Conjunction with an American Writer. 8vo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The Wreck of the "Grosvenor."* An Account of the Mutiny of the Crew and the Loss of the Ship when trying to make the Bermudas. 8vo., pp. 120. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Notices of the following books are postponed to next number:

*The Christian's Heritage,* and other Sermons.

*The Art of Beauty.*